

Anglican Theological Review

EDITED BY

FREDERICK C. GRANT AND BURTON S. EASTON

Founded by SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

VOLUME XVI

OCTOBER, 1934

NUMBER 4

CHRISTIANITY AND THE VALUE OF TIME:

*Does Every Christian Philosophy Center in the Affirmation of
the Absolute Value of Time?*

By VICTOR MONOD, University of Strasbourg *

A problem has recently come to the attention of several European philosophers. It is the following. In the Christian message, is there something original, from the point of view of metaphysical thought? Is there a *Christian Philosophy*? Has the development of modern philosophical thought been influenced by the advent of Christianity? Or, on the contrary, has Christianity been unable to construct an edifice of original thought, and so has it been forced consequently to take quarters in the edifice of Greek philosophy? The recent Gifford Lectures, given in Aberdeen by Professor Étienne Gilson, of the Collège de France in Paris, were devoted to the problem of determining the nature of the Christian philosophy.

To this question, I think personally that we are able to give, in short, the following reply.

Greek thought and Christian thought have always clashed over

* An address delivered at Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, Evanston, May 2, 1934. It expounds one of the major theses of Dr. Monod's latest book, *Dieu dans l'Univers*, a work recently crowned by the Institut de France.

the different values which they accord to the idea of Time. Greek thought has struggled to eliminate the idea of Becoming. It has always endeavored to attain the Intemporal, the unmoving and perfect Idea which dominates the flow of things. Nevertheless, as it has not been able to deny Movement or Becoming, it has tried to picture every movement as circular or cyclical, that is to say as a movement without proper significance or proper value. Temporal beings and things possess, in the eyes of Plato and Aristotle, only the appearance of the Unforeseen and of the Undetermined. To the eyes of the wise man, it is evident that their course necessitates returning to the same point in an eternal repetition. The day, the month, the year, the great cosmic year divide thus by a perpetual renewing the vanity of all things. The World has no beginning nor end. It admits neither failure nor success, neither progress nor fall: it is a closed circle of which all points have the same value or the same non-value.

On the contrary, the central Judaeo-Christian affirmation is that of the absolute value of Time. Each instant, each being contains an irreplaceable and unique wealth. The world has begun. The world will end. The history of the world has a goal. This follows definite stages and only God understands the whole process. The God of the Bible, the God of the Christian conscience is, above all, a God who reveals himself in a progressive and continuous manner, an aggressive and conquering God, who builds the world by successive acts, who gains some victories and undergoes some defeats. To the serenity of the Greek thinker, the Christian opposes the continual tension of the believer, co-worker with God for the salvation of the world, attempting by prayer and works to make all things new.

This opposition between two pictures of the world—the Greek picture, that of a circumference of which no point has proper significance, the Christian picture, that of a spiral of which the summit is always new and unknowable—seems to me appropriate to illustrate the originality of Christian metaphysics. For the Greeks, God will always be searched for in Space, in the regular and unchangeable manifestations of Nature. For the Christians,

God will always be searched for in Time, in the history of Inspiration, in the succession of the prophets and divine messengers who have explained the meaning of the events of yesterday and who will announce the history of to-morrow. The life of the world has an ethical meaning and each stage of history brings us nearer to the final end.

It is worthy of remark that the science of the twentieth century has been led by independent roads to interpret the Universe in temporal terms, to place in the first rank the notions of evolution, of emergence, of progression, of degradation or dissipation of energy. It has a tendency to avoid the mechanistic and cyclical conceptions which deny the profound significance of Time and which see in the Universe an eternal renewing of identical phenomena. Modern Science sees more and more in the succession of material phenomena an irreversible history which has had a beginning and will have an end. Christian Metaphysics has received unexpected support and fortification from the side of the physicists and the astronomers. Also we have never seen so many studies made of the relations between the physical sciences and Christian thought, as during the last few years.

I should like to try to place in the light the character of *Time philosophy* which possessed Christian thought from the beginning, and which, quite independently, has been emphasized by modern scientists or modern philosophical writers, like Henri Bergson or Edouard le Roy.

One can find the proof that the problem of Time is essentially a Christian problem in the history of literature as well as in the history of philosophy.

Many centuries ago, Plotinus, who made the transition between Greek and Christian thought, was meditating on the nature of Time. He saw in it the result of a fall. Eternity appeared to him as a movement always completed, as a desire always fulfilled, as a cycle always closed. On the contrary, if an interval, no matter how small, separated the desire from its completion, if a fall, even infinitely tiny, broke the equilibrium, then the eternal order would be upset. The apparition of Time is this new fact,

this constant disturbance. Time is then linked for Plotinus to the birth of the human soul, to the appearance of subordinated personalities, of sons begotten by one Father. Time explains the existence of the Spiritual, the venture of multiple beings who develop part by part and who have always a future before them. But if it is true that human consciences are obliged to live a temporal existence, they know and deplore their degradation, according to Plotinus, they suffer from it and they aspire to return to an untemporal and impersonal existence. If Time weighs on us, it is necessary to liberate ourselves from it, in order to be reabsorbed in God and in Eternity. In brief, for Plotinus as for the Greek thinkers who preceded him, if Time exists, it exists only as a transitory illusion which engenders nothing absolute, a fall followed by a necessary return to the Intemporal.

Augustine, the great Christian thinker, in his turn, was during his meditations forced to face the problem of the nature of Time. It seems to him, as to Plotinus, that Time is the mark of the inferior condition of creatures, a temporary degradation :

“ I have been scattered in Time of which the order is unknown to me; and my thoughts are divided by the tumultuous variety of things which pass—my thoughts, which are the substance of my soul and will remain divided, until I sink into Thee, O God, purified and melted in the fire of Thy love.”¹

But Augustine does not see in Time a simple prison from which it is necessary to escape as soon as possible. He sees in it the place of trial and liberty. He questions himself concerning the permanent motives which require man and God to live in Time and to be without ceasing confined by the Becoming and the Unforeseen.

“ God of goodness, why does man rejoice more in the salvation of a soul which seemed without hope and which is delivered from the greatest peril, than in the salvation of a soul which does not cause anxiety or whose the danger was less? Thyself, O merciful Father, Thou rejoicest more in a single penitent than in ninety and nine persons which need no repentance! . . . Thou rejoicest in us and in the angels . . . because Thou art always the same and Thou knowest in an immutable manner those things which change without ceasing.

But why does the soul rejoice more when it finds again or recovers those things which it loves, than when it had not lost them?”

¹ *Confessions xi. 27.*

In a word, why does Time, this lengthening of history, add to the flavour of things? Why does it enrich them?

"A bride is not delivered immediately to her husband; perhaps she would have less value in his eyes, if he had not desired her some time before he obtained her. Thus, in shameful pleasures as in legitimate delights, as in the pure exchange of friendship, and finally in the return of this one who was dead and who has been recovered, everywhere great joys are preceded by great sorrows. Why is that, O God? Why, when Thou art to Thyself an eternal joy and when all things rejoice in Thee, why is this part of things which is man passing through these alternatives of perfection and blemishes, of wounds and healings? Is this the law of these things, and hast Thou imposed these limits upon them, when, from the height of the heaven to the depth of the earth, from the beginning to the end of the ages, from the angel to the worm, from the first movement to the last, Thou givest all goods, Thou hast placed each thing in its order, and hast given to each its time?"²

Thus, for Augustine, Time is the law of things, the universal law which embraces angels and men and implies the idea of alternative, of spiritual and progressive development. It is in a temporal frame that God deliberately placed human personalities. It is through appeals perceived in Time that He makes them approach Him. Time is, in the universe, the great soul-engendering power. The religious soul is developed by means of a driving impulse and of regressions, of ascension and of fall. Conversion is for it the essential phenomenon.

Conversion, the recital of a conversion, the patient narration of the life of a soul, Confession to God and to men: such is, in effect, the personal and original contribution of Augustine to the heritage of Christian thought. But has the profound novelty, the psychological and metaphysical overthrow that the *Confessions* of Augustine evidence in comparison with Greek antiquity, been sufficiently set in the light? Even from the literary point of view, this novelty is manifest!

The literature of antiquity does not give us examples of autobiography. It knows, it is true, and gives several examples of the biographies of great men. But it always pictures these great men as representing continuously one and the same eminent virtue. The wise man, according to Plutarch, has received a divine

² *Confessions* viii. 3.

gift, the gift of courage, of intelligence, or of purity. But he makes no progress. The events of his life only serve to illustrate continuously that virtue which he incarnates. Aristotle says that the perfect man has neither enthusiasm nor memory; he speaks neither of himself nor of others. On the contrary, Augustine wishes to portray the successive steps of his life from his very birth. He neglects neither his infancy nor the crisis of his adolescence. He was pleased to recount the modifying influences which continually determined his destiny. These influences were not merely casual. While retracing the history of his sins, Augustine meant to illustrate the history of the love of God towards himself. The incessant solicitude of God was continually exercised upon those things which were hidden even from Augustine's most intimate friends, those things which constitute the innermost workings of his soul. The roarings of the heart of Augustine were without ceasing before God.³ Thus, behind the incoherent gropings of a troubled soul, Augustine shows us the patient divine pedagogy which attracts His children in Time. The God of the *Confessions* is neither hurried nor brutal. He knows the value of this moment of time, of this *punctum temporis*, before which the unconverted Augustine will equivocate a long time before coming to a final decision.⁴ A soul knows itself and is known by God only in Time.

Augustine has not only recounted the long windings of his own conversion. Around him there were numerous persons who were following the same Pilgrim's Progress. He tells us of the conversion of his friend Nebridius which forecasts the stages of his own.⁵ He shows us especially his mother Monica, always near to him. Monica, it has been justly said,⁶ "made the same spiritual voyage as Augustine, but she was always one step ahead of her son: finally, when their courses converge, Monica disappears. Monica is the silently prophetic one, who determines

³ *Confessions* vii. 7.

⁴ *Ibidem* viii. 11.

⁵ *Ibidem* iv. 4.

⁶ Quoted from Guitton, *Temps et éternité chez Plotin et Augustin*, Paris, 1933, p. 273. I owe to this book many valuable suggestions.

the order of things by the power of desire. Often she has an obscure notion of the future which she draws not from a vision, but from faith in the efficacy of her trials and her tears. . . . To the readers of the history of Augustine, Monica gives, among many episodes and many vicissitudes, the assurance of a peaceful end. Her presence, calling back the past and announcing the future, raises Augustine above the disasters of his life; she outlines to him his destiny."

In thus making his slow and progressive conversion and that of those around him a continuous demonstration of the Providence and Love of God, Augustine broke definitely with the Greek conception of the life of the soul and fixed the Christian tradition. Under the influence of Christian ideals, a romantic and psychological literature began to flourish, which was anxious to retrace the history of the times and the seasons of each human individual. The *Pilgrim's Progress* of John Bunyan, a marvelous book of the adventures of the Christian soul, brings to us, after the march of thirteen centuries, a replica to the *Confessions* of Augustine. These two books constitute a literary type which has no parallel in the literature of antiquity and which cannot be fully savored except by Christians. These adventures of life are interior. Bunyan, in his prison, is as great a discoverer of new territories as Herodotus or the older Pliny. When you read Augustine or Bunyan, you understand more fully that there is, properly speaking, a Christian philosophy of life, and that this philosophy has its center in the affirmation of the positive value of Time. Time is the reign of faith, of the Unforeseen, and also the reign of mystery.

Time, in effect, is always for us more mysterious than Space. Precisely because our consciousness places itself, knows itself only in time, it does not succeed in dominating the nature of time, as it dominates the nature of space. That which we are ourselves is more obscure to us than that which is exterior to us. The spatial knowledge of the world that positive science is seeking, has progressed, with giants' stride, without ever recognising regression or limitation. To-day, the astronomers compute the

dimensions of the universe in distances corresponding to hundreds of millions of light-years. On the other hand, we are not able to explain any better than Augustine an act as simple as that of singing a hymn. The singer enunciates alternative long and short syllables, but these are only long in comparison with the short syllables, and vice-versa. How are we able to measure them, when the present is measured in comparison with a past which has already disappeared, or with a future which does not yet exist? When I sing *Deus creator omnium* to a certain tune, I accomplish an act impossible to analyse fully in terms of space, an act impossible to explain by the aid of a linear opposition of the present and of the past.⁷ The mystery of the action of thought is centred in the mystery of Time, in the strangeness of a succession which, at once, accumulates and disintegrates, being continuously enriched and continuously impoverished.

Christian thought, or more exactly biblical thought, precisely because it sees God and man in time, was led to bring men to a certain form of restlessness and incompleteness of soul which contrasts vividly with the serenity of the antique soul. For the Christians, each instant possesses a thrilling sense. It is necessary to watch and never to sleep, to keep the loins girded and the lights burning. The anguish of the unforeseen, the inability of all to experience the interior drama of conversion, are the characteristics which have always distinguished the Christian soul from others. Pascal wrote in the *Mystery of Jesus*: "Jesus will be in agony till the end of the world. One ought not to sleep during this time."

If then, the preceding interpretations are correct, it seems evident that a certain philosophy, a certain metaphysical interpretation of the Universe, a certain *Weltanschauung*, is always inseparable from the most essential Christian affirmations. How could we now miss the fact that modern philosophical trends converge in supporting a temporal representation of the Universe? The twentieth century has brought us a new Natural Philosophy. It has succeeded in disengaging itself from the mechanistic and

⁷ *Confessions xi. 25.*

cyclical conceptions which dominated Nineteenth century thought, as previously they had dominated Greek thought. It has placed in the first rank a temporal picture of the world. It has said over and over: the world is a history always new and always pregnant with unforeseen events. Nothing ever repeats itself. Even the perfect ellipses which the planets, according to Newton, describe indefinitely around the sun are not identical with themselves. They make up the curves of tightly locked spirals which are never exactly closed in upon themselves. In fact, all satellites insensibly draw nearer to, or swerve away from, the central fixed star in the course of time. All is always new. The coefficient *Time* ought to figure in every description of the world, but it is necessary to add that this Time-coefficient works with extreme slowness. Centuries, millennia, hundreds of thousands of years are necessary to bring forth the vital appearances which, on our planet, assume the forms of a humble flower of the fields, a reed blown by the wind. The Spirit animates and directs matter; spirit *emerges* insensibly from inert nature and takes its bound on the spring-board of life: but all this demands an infinitely long duration of time. We are far from having exhausted all the spiritual significance of this metaphysics of becoming, of slow becoming—which seems to correspond fairly well with the classical conception of Christian revelation traversing the centuries, of the God of Israel making himself known in history “at sundry times and in divers manners.”

RECENT TEXT STUDIES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

By HENRY A. SANDERS, University of Michigan

In 1881 there appeared two epoch-making works, the Westcott and Hort edition of the Greek New Testament, and the Revised Version, which gave in English most of the results of that textual study. Yet the influence of these two books on their respective fields has been most unequal. The contest of the Revised Version against the King James Version resulted in almost complete defeat, but the Greek *Textus Receptus*, the Received Text, though bulwarked by the acceptance of all biblical scholars from its first appearance in print, in the Erasmus edition of 1516, has from the first fought a losing fight against the "so-called" Neutral text of the Westcott and Hort edition. The spirited defence by Burgon, Miller and others prolonged the contest, but did not change the result. All scholars eventually recognized that Westcott and Hort had shown the later and contaminated character of the Received Text. This was the text of Constantinople and the Eastern Empire, and seems in the main derived from the text of Antioch. There some time around 300 A.D. an improved text was produced doubtless by intentional revision but on the basis of the existing divergent texts known in that locality. Yet the aim of its editor was to produce a full text, so the additions and interpolations known from the MSS then in circulation were in general incorporated, and even conflate readings produced by the union of variants drawn from different MS traditions are found in not inconsiderable numbers.

To have shown the untrustworthy character of a text which had held sway so long in the New Testament field, was a great achievement, but Westcott and Hort attempted much more. They condemned the Western text, found in the bilingual MS Codex Bezae, as well as in the Old Latin MSS and in one Old Syriac MS, as a paraphrase resulting from the work of some

early editor. Still another edited text, which they called "Alexandrian," they found in a group of MSS allied with the Coptic Versions. Among the thousands of New Testament MSS they found but two that had preserved a relatively pure text. These are the Vatican and the Sinaitic, both MSS of the fourth century, the oldest of all the New Testament MSS known at the time. The fact that these two MSS generally united in supporting a shorter form of the text than that found in the other three groups seemed to Westcott and Hort a strong proof that this was the original text, a claim certainly strengthened by the superior age of its chief representatives. It was named the Neutral text. Yet there was one false assumption of Westcott and Hort which I must at least mention, since it was repeated in substance only last year by Sir Frederic Kenyon in his Schweich Lectures, p. 7; namely, that it is a commonplace in the textual criticism of ancient classical authors to give preference to a few early MSS over an overwhelming mass of later date. That is not true today, and was not universally accepted at any time, though Ribbeck's *Vergil* may be offered as an example. It is, however, true that when most of the MSS of a classical author belong to the fifteenth century, even one or two of an earlier date are apt to be given the preference, because the fifteenth century MSS are almost without exception disfigured by the emendations and falsifications of Renaissance scholars. In the New Testament, the case is not similar. There are MSS preserved from every century from the fourth to the sixteenth, and to defend two against two thousand when the difference in age of some was slight is not only unscholarly but borders on the ridiculous.

Already before the contest between the Received Text and the Neutral Text had begun, a group of four MSS called the Ferrar Group (now named Family 13) had been published in 1877. The importance of these MSS was not recognized by Westcott and Hort and the group was included among the Western MSS. Yet it was from similar discoveries that the seemingly unassailable position of the Neutral text was to be undermined. Another group consisting of the purple MSS was found and published at

various times from 1883 to 1900. These four MSS written on purple parchment in letters of silver or gold all date from the sixth century, and have a very similar text. They help to bridge the gap between the Received Text and the Antiochian text, as found in the Alexandrinus of the British Museum and other MSS. They fitted in well with the Westcott and Hort scheme.

The next important discovery was the Sinaitic Syriac, a palimpsest MS of the Four Gospels in a Syriac translation closely related to the Curetonian MS, which had been known for some forty years, and had been assigned to the same Western class as the Old Latin MSS. But this palimpsest MS found on Mt. Sinai in 1892 by two English women, Mrs. Gibson and Mrs. Lewis, complicated the problem much more than had the Ferrar group. In the first place it was a fourth century MS and so of equal age with the Vatican and Sinaitic of the Neutral Group. Also it lacked some of the striking variants of the Curetonian Syriac and more of those supported by the Old Latin. It also added new and interesting variants not previously found in the Western group, some of which were found in the one or the other of the representatives of the Neutral Group. In brief, it was a Western text but shortened, and it was primarily, but not entirely, in omissions that it drew near to the Neutral text.

Another group of four MSS, called from its chief member Family 1, was published in 1902 by Kirsopp Lake. It had a close relationship with Family 13 and with some other individual MSS of Syriac affinities. It seemed partly to bridge the gap between the Old Syriac and Old Latin MSS, but most scholars still continued to refer all of them to the Western Group, though recognizing that the different members of the group showed too much variation for them all to be considered very close descendants of a single recension. Also, the discovery of different families of MSS within the Group and the fact that some of these were as early as the fourth century, together with the appearance of notable Western variants in the Church Fathers as early as the middle of the second century, established an earlier

proved origin for this Group than for the Neutral text. This early date for the origin of the text of the Western Group was made even more necessary by the attempt to derive all of the families from a single origin, for the variations were often most striking. For example, the story of the woman taken in adultery and the words of Jesus, "Let him who is without sin cast the first stone," are omitted in the Sinaitic Syriac, but not in the Palestinian; also it is omitted in many Old Latin MSS as well as in the Neutral text and in the oldest representatives of the other families; yet it is found in Codex Bezae, the Old Latin MSS *b*, *c*, *e*, *ff*, *j*, and most later MSS. Family 1 omitted it in its regular place after John vii. 51 but added it at the end of that Gospel, while Family 13 placed it in Luke just following xxi. 38. Such variations as this in the Western Group should indicate that its origin was by gradual growth, rather than from a single recension.

More puzzling still was the testimony of the Freer Gospels which I published in 1912. This is a MS of 374 pages, containing practically all of the Four Gospels. It is written in a fine sloping uncial hand, so little known at that time that when I dated it in the fourth century I was criticised by all scholars except Grenfell. But the attempt to refer it to the sixth or seventh century quickly yielded and now even biblical scholars admit that it is as early as the fifth century, and palaeographers headed by Schubart place it in the fourth. The first quire of John, consisting of 16 pages, is written in a different hand, for which no parallels exist. I have hesitatingly claimed it also for the fourth century, relying on its worn and aged appearance, and on the title and the quire number, which seem by the same hand that added the other titles and quire numbers, at the time the rest of the MS was written, i.e. in the fourth century. Yet others still date it in the seventh century, a difference in dating hard to parallel in the science of palaeography.

However, the age of this MS is not its most striking characteristic, but rather the way in which the different types of text are mixed. The whole of Matthew and Luke from viii. 13 to the end are of the Received Text type, though showing some variants

of the Western type. Luke i to viii. 13 and John v. 12 to the end are of the Neutral or Alexandrian type, though with a good many variants of an older or uncorrected type in John. John i to v. 12, the added quire of questioned date, though somewhat similar to the Neutral text, must be classified as an older and uncorrected text, but of an Egyptian variety. Mark also shows two different types of text. The first five chapters have a pure Western text of the North African Latin type, while the rest of the Gospel shows a closer affiliation with the Old Syriac, with Family 1, Family 13, and other Syriacising MSS. I therefore assigned it to the Western text, but considered the relationship closer to the Syriacising families in the Group.

Such was my opinion in 1912, but we shall hear more of this text of Mark later.

The difficulty of reconciling such a combination of types of text in one MS is apparent, and it is certainly inconsistent with so simple and absolute a classification of MSS as was assumed by Westcott and Hort. This difficulty is increased by the age of the Freer MS and its failure to agree with the division between older and later text-additions, as suggested by Westcott and Hort's system. Thus the last twelve verses of Mark was to them an interpolation of the Antiochian text and so could appear in no good older MS. Yet it is not only present in the fourth century Freer Gospels, but even adds after xvi. 14 the following important variant: "And they answered and said, this generation of lawlessness and unbelief is under Satan who does not permit the beings made unclean by evil spirits to comprehend the truth and power of God. Therefore reveal thy righteousness. Now they said to Christ and Christ replied to them, that the limit of the years of the power of Satan hath been made full, but other terrible things draw near and in behalf of those who have sinned I was delivered unto death, in order that they may return to the truth and may no longer sin, that they may inherit the spiritual and incorruptible glory of righteousness, which is in Heaven." So remarkable an interpolation, found in no other MS and referred to only by Jerome, creates a problem, irrespective of the

relationships of the MSS. It can not be dismissed merely because it is inconsistent with Mark in both thought and style, and so necessarily a late interpolation, for it is incorporated in the last twelve verses of Mark, themselves an interpolation inconsistent with the thought and style of the rest of that Gospel. In my original publication I assumed that it was a part of the later Gospel, perhaps from the hand of the Elder Aristion, used to complete the unfinished Gospel of Mark. But whatever explanation is employed, the authenticity of the end of Mark is not established by its occurrence in the Freer Gospels, though the interpolation is made to appear the product of an early age.

Less puzzling, but more productive of immediate results, was the text of the Koridethi Gospels, found in the Caucasus in 1906 and fully published in 1913. This MS has been dated as late as the ninth century. It is written in coarse and extremely crude uncials by a scribe quite ignorant of Greek. The date is therefore most uncertain and it may have been as early as the seventh century. The text is, however, older for it was doubtless copied without change except for errors of ignorance from a fourth or fifth century archetype.

In 1923 Kirssopp Lake and R. P. Blake published a study in which they associated this MS with Family 1, Family 13, the Syriacising MSS 28, 565, and 700. B. H. Streeter in his book *The Four Gospels*, 1924, claimed Caesarea as the original home of this text. In a second article Blake added the Georgian Version to this family, called from its chief member Family ⑩. Though I had called attention in my original publication to the agreement of the Freer Gospels with Family 1, Family 13 etc. in the text of most of Mark, Streeter was the first to link it with the text of Caesarea, thus making this portion of the Freer MS the oldest representative of that city text. Yet it is probably not the purest form of that text, an honor to be claimed rather by the Georgian Version, portions of which were published by Lake and Blake in the second of the above mentioned articles. The identification of the text with Caesarea is based on the similarity to New Testament quotations in those Fathers who wrote in

Caesarea, particularly Origen and Eusebius, and may be considered as established. It is, however, but little easier to reconstruct a single original form for this text than for the so-called Western Group, to which earlier these MSS were assigned.

The problem of the Western Group has been simplified by this division into two families, or perhaps three, but it has not been solved. Rather we have obtained two or three problems in the place of one, to which must be added the greater problem of the relationship of these families.

We must now turn back somewhat to trace the development of text theory during the publication of these newly discovered MSS. The Westcott and Hort edition of 1881 had given a new grouping to the MSS and a text in accord with the principles of that classification of MSS, but no complete critical apparatus. Scholars continued to use Tischendorf's edition of 1869-72 as the basis for further text studies. The need of a new edition incorporating later discoveries aroused the Germans, who under the leadership of H. von Soden brought out a three-volume edition in the years 1902-1913. First a study of all known MSS was made on the basis of the comparison of certain selected, crucial passages in each. Having then organized all known MSS into families and sub-families, it was possible to simplify the text apparatus by mentioning only the families that supported any given reading, except in so far as any individual MS had an important variant not agreeing with its respective family.

This huge edition brought to the knowledge of scholars a good many MSS of importance, but it changed the numbering of the MSS, was filled with errors of collation, and the mass of material assembled proved beyond the strength of the editor to assimilate.

Von Soden divided the New Testament MSS into three great groups, K, I and H. K was really the Received Text, though many variant types were distinguished, most of which were the predecessors or related to the predecessors of that late Byzantine type of text. All were derived from the Antiochian recension. Group I was the great Western group, still more enlarged and separated into many divergent families, but von Soden traced

them all to a text used by Origen in the third century. Von Soden's H text included both the Neutral and the Alexandrian texts of Westcott and Hort. All these MSS were derived, according to him, from a recension made by Hesychius in Alexandria about 300 A.D.

In spite of the great array of MSS studied, von Soden's scheme differed but little in its primary divisions from the Westcott and Hort system. To be sure, the old Neutral and Alexandrian families had been united into one, but that was not a radical difference, since the two groups were more nearly similar than many subgroups in the great Western family. The important contribution of the von Soden edition was the attempt to refer the other two groups to definite recensions as Westcott and Hort had referred the Antiochian parent of the Received Text. He has found little support for his claim that the Western text came from a recension used by Origen, and the recent establishment of the Caesarean text has given a better explanation to what few arguments he had advanced. On the other hand his Hesychian Recension, somewhat expanded and corrected and with the name Hesychius eliminated, has continued to grow in favor. Only a few English Biblical scholars and the better known perhaps of the American continue to support the Neutral text, apparently still believing in miracles, for it would have required a continuous succession of miracles to preserve a pure form of text through three centuries, when all new Bibles had to be copied by hand.

One needs to read but a page of printers' proof or check a typewritten letter before signing in order to appreciate that in these modern times the human hand is liable to error. The thousands of MSS preserved from the middle ages illustrate the prevalence of error in that period, but might there not have been a time in the early church when religious fervor and the spirit of martyrdom enabled even scribes to avoid error? It is true that we have no check on the earlier part of this period, but the latter part shows the same tendency to error as is observed in the MSS of the middle ages. Even the famous Vatican and

Sinaitic MSS of the fourth century, on the remarkable agreement of which Westcott and Hort built their theory of the Neutral text, exhibit so many individual differences that H. C. Hoskier in his two volume work, *Codex B and Its Allies*, filled 900 large and closely printed pages with the enumeration and discussion of the more important of these differences. The Freer Gospels of the same century showed the existence of all the major varieties of text already at that early time. The existence of the great majority of the most notable text variants is further confirmed by newer critical editions of the Church Fathers, in which the New Testament quotations are freed from the harmonizing influence of the Received Text of the Middle Ages. Many of the striking variants which characterize the great Western family in its various groups are found in the quotations of Justin Martyr and Irenaeus of the second century and not until the fourth century do we find any of the Church Fathers uniting in support of a corrected text. But there is further evidence for these early centuries represented by few or no complete New Testament MSS. This evidence is found in the fragments, both on papyrus and parchment, of which over 150 are known and all the more important ones published. Most of these are to be dated before the seventh century and come from Egypt, so that they give us ample hints as to the character of the MSS that circulated there before the eighth century, the time when complete MSS become sufficiently numerous for comparative study. These fragments have seldom been published by Biblical scholars. Thirty of them are found in the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, and many more in similar collections. They are usually small and the editors have not generally been able to assign them to a definite type of text, but they always furnish numerous variants, many of which have to be classed as individual errors. In other words, the same condition prevailed as has been thoroughly established in the Homeric papyri. Uncorrected texts and the prevalence of individual errors were the rule, and not the exception.

In 1926 I published a large fragment containing most of the twenty-sixth chapter of Matthew. It formed nearly a whole

page of a papyrus MS which I dated unhesitatingly in the third century, though some scholars, perhaps influenced by the text, have dated it as late as the end of the fourth century. So large a fragment containing the account of the Lord's Supper and the betrayal furnishes an abundant supply of variants, which definitely determine the general character and affiliations. In spite of the fact that the fragment came from Egypt, where the Alexandrian and Neutral texts were supposed to hold sway, its text was found to be Western. Naturally it agreed also with variants found in Alexandrian and Caesarean MSS, but generally only when there was also Western support for these variants, or when the Antiochian text also gave support. In other words it departed from the so-called Western tradition only when that tradition was shown to be in error.

This surprising discovery was confirmed by two fragments of Acts, one published by me in 1927 and the other by Vitelli and Mercati in 1932. In the passages covered by both of these fragments the demarcation between the Alexandrian text and the Western text, as found in the Codex Bezae, the margin of the Harsleian Syriac, and at times in a few Greek or Latin MSS, was so pronounced that no one has ventured to deny their Western character. This early appearance of the Western text in Egypt has proved more difficult for the defenders of the Neutral text to explain than even the predominance of Western readings in the New Testament quotations of all the earlier Church Fathers.

Such results from the study of two papyrus fragments encouraged me to extend my study to all that were available, in spite of the frequent assertion that most of them were too small for the text character to be settled definitely. It is true that in the case of some fragments only inferences could be drawn, but evidence was found everywhere. A portion of this study was published in 1933 covering eighteen fragments of Matthew, seven of Mark, sixteen of Luke, nineteen of John and fourteen of Acts, all from Egypt. In these five New Testament books the type of text of each of the MS families was sufficiently well known, so that each papyrus fragment could be assigned to a

particular group, or designated as a mixture of the text of two groups. The fragments with pure text all fell in the third or early fourth century. All were pure Western. About 300 A.D. readings from the Alexandrian or Neutral text began to appear, but did not predominate until near the sixth century. No fragment was found with a pure Alexandrian text. The few fragments from the later centuries that had a comparatively pure Western text probably came from desert monasteries, which remained uninfluenced by the prevailing Bible text of Egypt.

Among the seventy-five fragments thus studied not one showed a close relationship to the Antiochian text, and only one has been claimed as a representative of the Caesarean text, a claim made by Lake and Blake in their second article on the Caesarean text. This is one of the latest of the fragments, being dated tentatively in the seventh century. Furthermore, of the thirty-two notable text variations found in it only one is supported by the Caesarean alone, while seven of the most important are found in both the Caesarean and the Western types. Furthermore, twenty-two of the variants are opposed to the Caesarean text as established by Lake and Blake. The relationship of this fragment with the Western text is much closer, for seven of its variants are found in the Western text alone, with which it disagrees in only sixteen readings, ten of which are shown to be individual errors by complete lack of support elsewhere.

The fragment is remarkable not only for its strong Western trend but still more for the lack of Alexandrian readings. The weak admixture of Caesarean and Antiochian readings is quite intelligible in so late a fragment, for the Antiochian text was at that time known and used everywhere outside of Egypt and the Caesarean text seems to have still lived on Mt. Sinai as late as the ninth century. Mt. Sinai is so near to Egypt that influence from there might easily reach an individual monastery in Egypt.

It is probably clear from this discussion of the Greek evidence only, that the problem of the New Testament text is not so simple and clear as Westcott and Hort and later von Soden thought it. But we must add to the complexity before attempting to come to any conclusion.

In the previous discussion I have referred to the Old Latin text. By this I mean the text of the Bible used in all Latin speaking provinces before Jerome made the translation in 383 A.D. which became the Vulgate. But while that has been referred to as a single text and as such was treated as one family in the Western group not only by Westcott and Hort but also by von Soden, it in fact shows almost as many varied forms as the Greek text. This is no discovery by a modern scholar. It was known to Jerome himself and stated in his Introduction, where he addressed Pope Damasus as follows: "You urge me to revise the Old Latin version, and as it were to sit in judgment on the copies of the Scriptures, which are now scattered throughout the whole world; and inasmuch as they differ from one another you would have me decide which of them agree with the Greek original. . . . For, if we are to pin our faith to the Latin texts, it is for our opponents to tell us which; for there are almost as many forms of texts as there are copies. If on the other hand, we are to glean the truth from a comparison of many, why not go back to the original Greek and correct the mistakes introduced by inaccurate translators and the blundering alterations of confident, but ignorant, critics, and, further, all that has been inserted or changed by copyists more asleep than awake." Thus Jerome. Except for his unwarranted esteem of the original Greek, Jerome had a comprehension of the complicated text problem which it has taken nearly 1600 years for scholars of the New Testament text again to grasp.

But only fragments have survived from this mass of divergent Latin texts known to Jerome. Of these many have been published since the time of Westcott and Hort, some being from MSS as early as the fourth century A.D. Also a similar text, only partially corrected to the Vulgate form, has been found in many MSS of varying ages, and others of similar character will be found. The Gospels are better represented than the rest of the New Testament, but even there no complete uncorrected text of any form exists. In Matthew and Mark MSS *k* and *e* give a text identical with quotations found in St. Cyprian, that is,

North Africa in the third century. MSS *a*, *b*, *c* give even more of a text of the Gospels that circulated in France and its neighbors in the third and fourth centuries, hence called the European text. A similar text in Acts and Revelation is preserved in the MS named *Gigas*, which came from Bohemia. The Claromontanus of the sixth century has the same or a very similar text of the Epistles of Paul. Several MSS preserve the Italian text of the time of St. Augustine, the Old Latin text nearest related to Jerome's Vulgate. A Spanish text of Acts is preserved in the Perpignan MS. The two Usser MSS from Ireland have still a different text of the Gospels, partial support for which is found in many Irish and English Vulgate MSS.

Recently one of my pupils has found the same kind of text for Acts in a Latin MS of the University of Michigan Library. In that one book the MS has 1384 variations from the Vulgate text, of which over 700 are of first importance since they affect whole words, phrases, or even sentences. Many of these variants are supported by the North African Old Latin, or by the European or Spanish Old Latin. Others find their best support in the bilingual Codex Bezae and the Harclean Syriac. Very often support is found also in a few of the older Vulgate MSS and sometimes in individual Greek MSS, but only rarely do these MSS furnish the sole support. Though Biblical scholars have been slow to exploit it, the evidence is now complete that there was an Old Latin text of the New Testament circulating in Ireland before the existence of the Vulgate. Later this spread to England and to some extent to France and Germany. Much of this has been recovered and more will be. The original Old Latin text of the early Church will have to be reconstructed by a comparison of all these local texts. But the local texts can not then be disregarded, for the Greek and Latin New Testament existed side by side, and there was much interrelation between local texts in the two languages. I quote one instance to illustrate the problems that may arise. In the first verse of the Epistle to the Hebrews, we read: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by

the prophets." There can be no doubt about the correctness of the reading "the fathers," yet Codex Laudianus 108 of the Bodleian Library has "our fathers" and this is supported by a Greek papyrus fragment in the Amherst Collection, and by a second hand correction in the Beatty Epistles of Paul. Why should an eighth century Latin MS from England agree with two third century Greek fragments from Egypt? Doubtless there are many missing links in the chain that once connected these two, but all seem to have perished. Once there might have been as close a connection between the Greek Epistle to the Hebrews of Egypt and the Latin Version of North Africa, as the Freer Gospels and the Latin MS *e* reveal in the first chapters of Mark.

The Coptic Versions, the Bohairic, Sahidic, and Akhmimic, give us another side to the divergent texts in Egypt, and more MSS of these have been discovered in recent years, and have been published or soon will be. The Ethiopic, which seems in the main translated from a Coptic Version, often gives good, old readings no longer found in any Coptic MS. Much there also has perished.

Of the Syriac translation of the New Testament four Versions are known, all textually important except one. Even this does not complete the tale for the Armenian was translated from the Syriac and the Georgian from the Armenian. Both of these versions present much that is no longer found in Syriac. Especially the Georgian Version, which has recently been associated with the Caesarean text, presents a major problem in its ancestry and in the possibility of later revisions.

All this varying evidence of MSS and versions is being gradually put in a form that the next critical edition can utilize, but that will hardly be the New Tischendorf which a group of English scholars is now editing. There is much preliminary work to do in analyzing the relationships of the various versions and in locating the homes of divergent texts. Also new material is still coming to light.

Of this by far the most important are the Beatty Papyri, con-

sisting of 190 leaves bought in Egypt by Mr. A. Chester Beatty of London and first announced in November 1931. The collection comprises portions or fragments of twelve MSS, all Old or New Testament except one. Of these the one containing some thirty leaves from the Gospels and Acts has been published by Sir Frederic Kenyon. It belongs to the third century and so gives a real picture of an Egyptian Bible a full century older than any complete MS that is preserved. It has many and important variants, and these show no close relationship to the Neutral text of Westcott and Hort, thus adding one more death knell to that dying hypothesis. Sir Frederic thinks that it shows a certain relationship to the Caesarean text in Mark, and this possibility will have to be considered, though there are many minor agreements with the Western tradition which have not yet been found in representatives of the Caesarean text. It seems likely that this new text source, when thoroughly studied, will give much needed information on the relationship between the Western and the Caesarean texts. If the latter proves to be a descendant of the former only moderately edited, many puzzling text questions will be nearer solution.

A second MS in this collection contained the Epistles of Paul, but of this only ten leaves were in the mass of papyrus bought by Mr. Beatty. This also, together with the fragment of Revelation, has been published by Sir Frederic. Furthermore, thirty other leaves have been recently acquired by the University of Michigan. The extant leaves cover large sections from Romans, Hebrews, Second Corinthians, Ephesians, Galatians, and Colossians, and fragments of First Corinthians, Philippians, and First Thessalonians. Sir Frederic dates it early in the third century. On the basis of the writing I prefer to place it late in that century. It has many agreements with the representatives of the Western text, though these do not give us the clear picture of the unrevised text established for the Four Gospels and Acts. It also has many agreements with the Vatican MS, supposedly the representative of the Alexandrian Recension. There seem two possible explanations for these seemingly contradictory relationships.

Either the Beatty fragment of Paul gives a partial correction of a Western text to the Alexandrian recension, or it represents the text on which the Alexandrian recension was based, which must in that case be the Egyptian representative of the "so-called" Western text.

The Beatty New Testament find is completed with ten leaves from Revelation, covering large sections from the middle of the book. It is dated late in the third century and its text is not highly esteemed by Sir Frederic, probably because it disagrees with the Old Uncial MSS more often than it agrees. The text of Revelation has received much less attention than has that of the rest of the New Testament, and many of the older sources both in Greek and in the Versions are lacking. Therefore, I attach great importance to the Beatty fragment and am hopeful that it will restore a partial picture of the so-called Western text, which must have preceded the recensions in Revelation, as in the rest of the New Testament. It is clear that the Beatty Papyri give us a chance to understand better the rich material for textual study that has been gathered in the past fifty years. It is probable that more material will have to be gathered before the picture is complete, but already we can see the outlines. The so-called Western text is wrongly named. It is neither a recension nor a rewriting, but rather the original text with errors and additions varying in the different provinces. When several of these texts agree it gives presumptive evidence of the original text. On the differing types of the Western text, the city recensions were made, such as the texts of Alexandria, Caesarea, and Antioch. The scholars who made these recensions always had access to older and better MSS of their locality than are known today. The city recensions must remain a major source for the text. It is in these fields that more study is needed before a true critical edition can be produced.

In conclusion, if one asks what the progress has been in New Testament Studies during the past fifty years, we may answer briefly as follows: the Received Text has been abandoned, but an older, purified form of it is recognized as the text of Antioch

in the fourth century. The Neutral text has suffered the same fate by being recognized as the text of Alexandria around 300 A.D. The Western text has grown by the discovery and incorporation of new families until the territory, where it was once used, is seen to stretch from Palestine and Egypt on the east to Ireland on the west. This is not a simple or homogeneous text, but a group of related texts. Of these, the North African, the Old French, and the Italian Old Latin have been recognized as local types for years. Recently, several closely related families of this group have been set apart as the text of Caesarea in Palestine, though further study may show that various Palestinian texts are included rather than that all came from Caesarea. Also, a similar differentiation between the Alexandrian city text and the provincial text of Egypt is beginning to appear. In the west, distinctive forms of texts are being recognized also in Spain, in Ireland, and in England. This is the age of differentiation and localization. The constructive work, which will restore the original text out of these divergent traditions, belongs still to the future, but that text will neither shock nor astonish us when it comes. It will be a product of comparison, a mean between extremes, and so it will be neither like the King James Version nor like the Revised Version, but it will lie between.

THE PLACE OF GNOSTICISM IN THE HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN THOUGHT

By PAUL S. KRAMER, Faribault, Minnesota

The Gnostic heresies, so-called, have been a favorite theme of Christian apologists and historians in all ages of the Church. More anathemas have been hurled against the heads of the Gnostics than against any one real heresy. This is traceable to the dense ignorance that existed in regard to Gnosticism. The authorities on Gnosticism, chiefly Irenaeus and Hippolytus, have always been slavishly followed, and it seems to have been the characteristic of nearly all church writers from the second century down, to accept the dicta of their predecessors in the faith as axioms. Modern church historians with but few exceptions are content to state the Gnostic tenets as they are recorded by Irenaeus or Hippolytus, together with the opinions of these early writers, without reservation. That the Gnostics, in the decline of their peculiar system of thought, incorporated into it distinctly Christian beliefs, may be true, but this was done only in order to bolster up a crumbling fabric. At the time when this occurred, Gnosticism had fallen into decay and was doomed. As an example of this we have only to cite the teachings of Bardesanes and Marcion who were not really Gnostics, but more properly Docetics, true heretics.

The supposed connection between Gnosticism and Christianity is traceable to the extreme rationalism that marked all schools of thought during the first and second centuries of the Christian era. This was not only true in Alexandria but also in Rome, as the school of the Eclectics shows. This rationalism was the natural outgrowth of the failure of philosophy to satisfy the human mind with merely ethical teachings. The Religious Period of philosophy was, therefore, inevitable. A clear statement of a possible connection between the finite and the infinite was de-

manded. The intensity of this religious movement was shown by the eagerness with which foreign cults were received by the Graeco-Roman world, and the mingling of Oriental religions.

The establishment of Christianity presented a new and clearer method of knowledge concerning the world of the supersensuous. The Gnostics had constructed an elaborate system of spiritual powers for the purpose of bridging over the chasm between the world of sense and the world of spirit, in order to gain communion with God. But this connection was only apparent and not actual. How to supply the defect was of the highest importance. The Logos doctrine of Philo furnished no solution. The Logos of Philo was a pure spiritual form, neither created nor uncreated, the vice-regent of God, the angel or archangel which delivers to us the revelation of God, the instrument by which God made the world, the Demiurge. But the Logos was impersonal, which fact, together with the other attributes ascribed by Philo to it, made it impossible for the Gnostics to incorporate this conception of the Jewish philosopher into their system. The Logos of Philo could not furnish a rational connection between the material and the immaterial. The Gnostics in their study of the Logos theory of Philo must have reached a conclusion similar to that stated by Zeller:

"The definitions which, according to the presuppositions of our thought, would require the personality of the Logos are crossed in Philo by such as make it impossible; and the peculiarity of his mode of conception consists in his not perceiving the contradiction involved in making the idea of the Logos oscillate obscurely between personal and impersonal being. This peculiarity is equally misunderstood, when Philo's Logos is regarded absolutely as a person separate from God, and when on the contrary it is supposed that it only denotes God under a different relation, according to the aspect of this activity. According to Philo's opinion the Logos is both, but for this very reason neither one nor the other exclusively; and he does not perceive that it is impossible to combine these definitions into one notion."¹

The Logos of Philo was, therefore, too incomprehensible, too far removed from the world, to be accepted by the Gnostics as able to round out their system. Parseeism, from which the

¹ Zeller, *Philosophie der Griechen*, p. 378.

Gnostics had freely borrowed and from which their dualism received such strong support, could not supply the deficiency of the system. The Parsee mediator between God and the world, Zarathustra, for reasons opposite to those which hindered their acceptance of the Logos, would not answer. The Logos was too spiritual, Zarathustra too much like a man. The Logos dwelt too high, Zarathustra was of the earth. The Logos was impersonal, Zarathustra was too plainly and intimately connected with men, and therefore, must lack a true communion with God. By the adoption of Zarathustra the chasm would not have been closed, but merely removed from the supersensuous to the sensible world. It would still remain an insuperable obstacle between God and his creation.

That Zarathustra was born of royal lineage, that he was a religious reformer who lived most probably in Bactria, is accepted by all scholars. The accounts given of him, both by Oriental and Occidental writers, are so barren of facts and full of legends, that we really possess no reliable data concerning this remarkable man. We can compare him only with Sakyamuni the founder of Buddhism. Both were religious. Sakyamuni in his struggle against the corrupt Brahmanism of his time, declared that the old religious literature of India was false; there are no gods, and hence no need of mediators between gods and men. After his death the followers of Sakyamuni ascribed divine powers to him and he began to be worshipped as God, the Buddha.

Zarathustra fought against the ancient polytheism of his time, and insisted upon a monotheistic form of religion. Legends began to group themselves around his person and powers after his death, and he began to be revered and worshipped as the prophet and intimate associate of Ahura Mazda; he was a god. Through him also, Ahura Mazda gave his revelation, the Avesta, to man. This seems to have been the claim of Zarathustra himself.

The legendary accounts of Zarathustra did not come with sufficient authority to be received by the Gnostics, whose rationalism demanded that that only could be received as reasonable

which both appealed to the mind and also had behind it the consensus of reputable authorities.

Christianity was exerting a powerful influence upon the Roman world during the time of the Gnostics, and naturally attracted the attention of all thinkers. The inability of the Jewish-Alexandrine philosophy and Parseeism to supply the defect of their system drove the Gnostics to seek for it in Christian dogma. They readily found in Jesus of Nazareth what they were seeking. Jesus was both perfect man and perfect God. As perfect man He lived amid the contaminating matter without being affected by it. He was superior to it and spurned it. But owing to His human nature He could also come in contact with man and thus impart those characteristics that would make him acceptable to God. As perfect God He brought the spiritual into actual contact with the material, and thus joined the break that had existed between the Infinite and the finite. He solved the problem of dualism. The Gnostics, no doubt, saw the ideal of the sage, so eagerly sought by the Stoics, realized in Jesus, for Stoicism exerted a powerful influence upon all schools of thought during the time of the Gnostics. The Gnostics, however, could not accept the Christian teaching concerning Jesus as an article of faith. Their rationalism forbade this. So while they accepted the teaching they at once set about to explain the incarnation of God in Jesus.

Valentinus and his school adopted the following explanation of the existence of Jesus. In order to quiet the discord which resulted from the passion of Sophia, the thirty aeons of the Pleroma projected one aeon who should restore peace. This "Joint Fruit of the Pleroma" was sent out of the Pleroma into the Kenoma, and received from Achamoth and the Demiurge the three forms of matter, spiritual, animal and vegetable, out of which the universe was created. The body which Jesus received, however, was of the same nature as that possessed by the Demiurge, uncorrupted by the evil actions of men. At His birth, therefore, Jesus passed through the Virgin Mary as water through a tube.²

² Hippolytus, *Ref.*, Bk. VII, chh. xxxi and xxxii.

The account in Hippolytus is much fuller but in sum it is essentially this. Basilides, Saturninus and Carpocrates held the same doctrine with slight modifications.³

All the efforts of the Gnostics seemed to have been concentrated upon the attempt to make Jesus a member of the Pleroma. That this was an afterthought is seen from the contradictions in which they became involved. The number of the aeons comprising the Pleroma was complete; all possibility rested in them and the need of an addition to the number could only have resulted from contact with a new mode of thought. The popularity and widespread influence of Christianity seemed not only to presage for it universal acceptance, but also showed that it possessed elements of truth that could not be disregarded by its most pronounced opponents. The Gnostics, ever on the alert to find a remedy for the defect in their system, seized upon the Christian teachings concerning Jesus and modified them to suit their purpose.

This is apparent when we contrast the Gnostic and Christian schemes of redemption. Both agree in the basic assumption that in the world in which we live goodness, truth and beauty are everywhere thwarted in their expression by the power of evil. That a fallen angel brought confusion and evil into a world of perfect goodness, is the familiar Christian view. The Gnostic view is quite the opposite of this. The world is fundamentally evil, and to this evil world a fallen aeon brought a spark of light and goodness. The fall of this aeon is variously described in the different systems. It is explained in some as due to a weakness which this aeon (which was the furthest removed from God) possessed, and which made it unable to remain in the Pleroma; in other systems, sinful passion forced this aeon into the Kenoma. At any rate, however it came to be, the aeon fell and is imprisoned in the Kenoma and longs for return to the Pleroma.

Redemption is, therefore, essentially cosmical. It consists in the return of all things to what they were before the fall of this

³ *Ibid.*, chh. xiv–xvi; xx.

aeon, Sophia brought matter into existence and imprisoned the spark of Divine Light in it. This setting free of the light-spark is the process of Salvation. When it is fully accomplished, the evil matter will be burnt up.

The process of salvation is very much elaborated by Valentinus. After the creation of the world, in consequence of the fall of Sophia, Nous and Aletheia, by the command of the Propator, produce two new aeons, Christ and Holy Ghost, which restore order in the Pleroma, and the result is, as we have seen, that all the aeons together produce a perfect aeon Jesus, Soter, whom they offer to the Father. The aeon Christ, having pity on the abortive substance, born of Sophia, gives to it essence and form. The most perfect aeon now descends and after great suffering leads back the rebellious or fallen one to the Pleroma, where he unites with her in a spiritual marriage.

This process of redemption though basically cosmical is, however, made applicable to individual souls. The aeon Jesus is sent again as a second saviour, unites himself to the man Jesus, the son of Mary at his baptism, and becomes the saviour of men. Man is the creation of the Demiurge, and is composed of soul, body and spirit. His salvation consists in the return of his *Pneuma* to the Pleroma. If, however, he is not a full Gnostic, his *Psyche* shall return to Achamoth. Thus, the saviour imparts to the true "Gnostic" a knowledge of the higher world, and inspires him to seek after it. Further teaching furnishes the initiate with means by which he may thwart the attacks and influences of hostile spirits which everywhere confront him and seek to destroy his soul. All sorts of sacraments, rites, sealings, piercing of ears etc. are enjoined for this purpose.

It is everywhere apparent, throughout this scheme, that there is no discernible likeness between the Gnostic Soter and the historical Jesus. As a matter of fact, the Gnostic saviour does not save. There is no idea of atonement in Gnosticism. There is no sin to be atoned for, unless ignorance be so considered. The suffering of the so-called "saviour" in no way benefits man. Nor does he in any way infuse into the individual any power or

grace to draw him to God. He appears, really, as a teacher of the truth, the mere possession of which, it would seem, can save. Of the Christian idea of a real Saviour, who, possessed of divine and human love, seeks out sinners to save them, Gnosticism knows nothing.

Again, the Gnostic saviour has no human nature; he is an aeon, he only *seemed* a man. The aeon Jesus is, moreover, brought into the strangest relationships to Sophia. Though in the Valentinian system he appears as her spouse, in others he is often her son, and in others again, her brother. Sometimes he is identified with Christ, sometimes with Jesus; sometimes Christ and Jesus are the same aeon, sometimes they are different; sometimes Christ and the Holy Ghost are identified. Gnosticism tried desperately to utilize the Christian teaching concerning the Holy Ghost, but apparently never quite succeeded. In some systems the Holy Ghost is the *Horos*, or the *Methorion Pneuma*, the limiting power or Boundary Spirit; again he is the "Sweet Odour of the second sonship" (Basilides), or a companion aeon with the Christ. In some systems he is entirely left out.

Finally, it must be borne in mind that Jesus is never the central feature of Gnosticism as He is of Christianity, but only a link in the chain, important it is true, but possessing powers that are less than any of the aeons of the Pleroma. He was, in fact, projected, conceived by the joint efforts of the aeons, but formed by the Demiurge, who himself could not enter the Pleroma. To the Christian Jesus is God, to the Gnostic He was merely a power or emanation from God. The later Gnostic literature seems to furnish evidence of a bold attempt to enhance the importance and rôle of Jesus in a system of thought which really recognized no need for Him, and the result is a fantastic and fanciful picture which is proof positive that Gnosticism had run its course and that its disruption had begun.

It seems legitimate to assert, therefore, that Gnosticism as developed into a religio-philosophic system by Valentinus, Basilides, and others, was non-Christian in essence and fundamentally alien to the Christian scheme. The Gnostics, therefore, cannot

be justly called Christian heretics. The word "heretic" moreover, means a "self-chooser," one who perverts an established belief and changes it to suit his own mental conceptions as to what he thinks that belief ought to be. This definition demands that the person who so perverts a belief first acknowledge himself as one holding the belief. No Gnostic leader ever acknowledged himself a Christian; no Christian leader of the first four centuries ever asserted that the Gnostics were Christian. A Gnostic cannot, therefore, be called a heretic.

Even though it could be established that some of the individual Gnostics were professed Christians, this would not militate against the above assertion. It was no uncommon thing in the time of the Roman Empire for a man to become a member of a certain cult in order to discover the mysteries connected with it. In modern times men have become Mohammedans solely for the purpose of penetrating into the secrets of the holy city Mecca (e.g. Burton). It is not unreasonable, therefore, to say that if Gnostics became Christians it was merely for the purpose of learning more accurately Christian beliefs. This step was almost a necessity during the time of the Gnostics to enable them to get any reliable information whatsoever, owing to the merciless persecution which the Christians suffered at the hands of the pagans, from Nero to Diocletian.

From a study of Irenaeus and Hippolytus one receives the impression that the Gnostics founded those parts of their system which correspond in any way whatever to Christian beliefs, upon a study of Holy Scripture, and especially the New Testament. It is true that the Gnostics had the Septuagint at their disposal, but it is highly improbable that they possessed any accurate knowledge of the New Testament.

Valentinus died, according to Massuet, in 158. His system was probably completed about the year 140. We have no absolute knowledge of the existence of the Greek Testament as early as this. Portions of it no doubt were in use in the different churches. Quotations in Clement of Rome, Ignatius and Justin Martyr, show this. The general opinion is, however, that

the New Testament canon did not receive its present form until the third century. The statement of Irenaeus would, however, lead us to believe that Valentinus and other Gnostics were intimately acquainted with the whole of it. That they may have had knowledge of parts of the New Testament is probable, and that these were parts of the Gospels is very likely, since the account of the life of Jesus together with His acts, was first distributed among the churches. The fact, also, that the Gnostics borrowed chiefly from the life of Jesus would thus explain the source of their Christian knowledge.

The use that the Gnostics made of the Old Testament is explainable from their dependence upon Philo. Philo sought by an allegorical exegesis to establish its supremacy over Greek philosophy. The fact, also, that the Christians used the Old Testament in their worship, especially the Psalms, would give to it, in the eyes of the Gnostics, a certain value as a Christian authority. Since, moreover, they had found in Jesus the embodiment of the idea necessary for the completion of their system, they would naturally try to read into the text of the Old Testament such meanings as would seem to give authority to their own peculiar teachings in the opinions of Christians.

We conclude therefore, that the Gnostics were essentially a school of rationalistic philosophers. Their system was built up by a combination of Greek philosophy, Oriental speculation and Jewish-Alexandrine thought.

Although Gnosticism at first sight appears as a thoughtless syncretism of Greek philosophical systems and religious speculation, its development from a distinctly philosophical basis is most naturally accounted for when one considers the underlying trend of speculative thought through Plato. In the period before the Sophists, who represent the transition to the Socratic philosophy, there were two clearly distinguished sub-periods. The earlier thinkers stood in a very close relation to the previous religious and mythical views, and sought to substitute an intelligible hy-

pothesis, based on real things or events, for the myths of the poets. In doing this it was their method to fix upon one conception of fundamental importance, and they were forced to maintain it often in a one-sided manner. The later thinkers were not so bound by mythological conceptions, and merely attempted to adjust and to accommodate the more valuable elements in the earlier views. There is also to be noted in these successive periods a distinction in the religious views which were influential at the time. The earlier thinkers were largely controlled by the Olympian religion, which concerned chiefly the deities of the sky, earth and ocean. The worship of the Orphics and the Eleusinian mysteries, on the other hand, emphasized the immortality of the soul and its need for purification; thus directing the thought within and introducing a distinction which had most important consequences. These religions influenced especially the Pythagoreans and Plato.

The extant myths which described the generation of the gods and the origin of the universe, all implied a single connected process and an inclusion of everything in the universe within that process. Present, actual phenomena, such as sky, sea, days and seasons were unified in such beings as Uranus (heaven) and Gaia (earth) or Dionysus. The earlier philosophers were concerned to substitute actual concrete substances for these personifications. It was assumed by all that the world is one. The questions to be answered, therefore, were, from what did it come? What is the primal substance, the essential nature of things? The answers were various; Thales said "water"; Anaximenes, "air"; Anaximander, "the boundless" or "the infinite."

Into this almost wholly philosophical speculation, there was now introduced a distinctly religious element by the Ephesian Heraclitus. For him, the primal substance is "fire," of which all things are transformations. Now fire is a changeable thing, and to say that it is the ultimate nature of things, is to imply a process of change or flux, in which there is a "way downward,"

in which fire is transformed into things, and a "way upward," in which things are becoming fire. There is implied, further, a principle of rational law (*logos*) or justice (*dikē*) which controls the process. The law of change thus conceived by Heraclitus gave a union of the "one" and the "many."

The problem of the "one" and the "many," "permanence" versus "change," occupied the minds of the Eleatics and the Pythagoreans, though the latter were far more religious and ethical than speculative. There was usually, however, an over-emphasis on the first term of the antithesis, i.e. "the one." It was the work of Empedocles, Anaxagoras and the Atomists to combine these two terms in mediating theories. Certain elements are assumed to be permanent, and change, or the apparent arising and disappearing of things, is attributed to re-arrangements of these elements. To explain the re-arrangements, Empedocles and Anaxagoras introduced other elements which acted as forces, though they were not considered purely abstract forces. These were, for Empedocles, Love and Strife; for Anaxagoras the combining element was Nous, which ordered all things intelligently. With the succeeding philosophers a mediating theory of natural processes reached a clear formulation, and was developed, inevitably, into a system of materialism. The influence of these thinkers upon the speculative thought of the Gnostics is quite apparent.

With the Sophists and particularly with Socrates, philosophy takes on a much broader outlook and attempts to become practically applicable to the art of living. There is in Socrates a thorough appreciation of the social, political, and moral life of the Greek city-state, and the consequent attempt to discover eternal principles which may guide the individual in his daily life. In the Dialogues of Plato ethical, theoretical and artistic elements are all combined to give a new view of the world and a new interpretation of human experience. The religious conception of immortality and of the "other world," is introduced to give an answer to the demand for a distinction between the

relative and the absolute, between the changing and the permanent, and a metaphysical system is constructed embodying all these elements. The result is a clear-cut dualism. The impact of the Platonic philosophy, as mediated through Philo, upon the minds of the Gnostics is unquestionable, especially as regards their cosmogony.

Shortly after the period of Plato and Aristotle the influence of the Oriental religions upon all forms of thought became tremendous. The immediate result was an almost universal confusion. All faiths and philosophies of the world were meeting, and attempts were being made on every hand to establish by syncretism a universal system. Gnosticism, as we know it, owes its being to this syncretism. Its primary impulse was, however, philosophical rather than religious. It was an answer to the problem, into which all philosophies which aimed at being applicable to human living had been resolved, namely, Whence comes evil? This led to another question, What is the origin of the world? Oriental thought identified the two. The existence of evil was involved in the origin of the world. A full explanation of the one would include an explanation of the other.

The Gnostics believed that an answer could be given to these questions by proceeding by a thoroughly rationalistic method. So they set out on their speculative adventure. Their underlying motive was most practical. They believed that "knowledge" was power. They were convinced that it was not merely an agent for measuring values but itself a value, the most important element necessary for a perfect life of happiness, and a guarantee of everlasting bliss. Possession of *gnōsis* would in itself make it possible to overcome the evil inherent in a material world of existence and give promise of a blessed immortality. It was inevitable that their beliefs should express themselves in cult and ritual. What forms this took with the great Gnostics and their closest disciples, it is impossible to say. Practically all of our knowledge regarding Gnostic worship is confined to descriptions of rites and ceremonies which were clearly the possession of lesser

Gnostics, and which appear when Gnosticism as a system of thought had broken down. It is utterly inconceivable that such great minds as those of Basilides and Valentinus should be concerned with the magic, weird names, sounds, gestures and actions which characterized the ritual observances of their lesser disciples, nor is there any evidence that they were so concerned.

Why, then, did the great Gnostics fail of their purpose? They failed because, confining themselves to purely speculative reasoning, they inevitably reached an impasse. It was found impossible, rationally, to bridge over the chasm which separated the infinite from the finite. They instinctively felt that union with God must somehow be secured to make possible a complete redemption from the power of evil inherent in that which is essentially material, and proceeding from their premises it was impossible to accomplish this. As their skillfully fashioned fabric began to crumble they seized upon the Christian conception of Jesus, as a being possessing a nature both human and divine, to solve the problem of their dualism. But, as we have seen, their rationalism forbade their acceptance of the Christian idea as an article of faith and its whole conception was clearly opposed to their fundamental point of view. Thus the necessary union with God was impossible, and Gnosticism, both as a philosophical system and as a way of life, was doomed.

It is difficult to determine what specific service Gnosticism rendered to Christianity. Several things, however, are clear. In the first place, it forced the Church to determine what writings were to be regarded as authoritative, as against the Gnostic schools, each with its own pretended special revelation. Secondly, it compelled the Christian body to seek for a just view of the relation of Judaism to Christianity, and of the permanent value of the Old Testament writings, which Gnostics commonly rejected. Thirdly, and most important of all, Christianity was forced to assume a definite attitude toward the complex philosophical problems to which, indirectly at least, it had given rise. Faced with this problem, some minds in the Church, looking upon

the failure of Gnosticism as a clear indication of the worthlessness of all philosophy not Christian, were more or less hostile to the introduction of the rational element into the Christian mental life. Others favored an effort at reconciliation, and set themselves to the task of working it out. The result was, that Christian thought of the first four centuries was divided into two schools, the African and the Alexandrian, according to the respective attitudes assumed towards the incorporation of pagan philosophy or its attempted assimilation to Christian teaching.

THE ' META-RELIGIOUS '

By MARY ANITA EWER, Groton, New York

Das Metareligiöse; eine kritische Religionsphilosophie. By Oskar Bauhofer.
Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1930, pp. iv + 271. RM. 13.50.

Perhaps there was once a Golden Age when reason, authority, and experience alike seemed to the sincere to uphold the Christian Faith. But our age has no real memory of it. Science and Practical Affairs have so claimed Reason for their sphere that Apologetic has for a long time been driven to the sphere of emotional and aesthetic experience, to the Realm of Values. And the result has been, as we all know too well, increasing unreality. The gates have been opened wide to those critics who reduce to a dream the God of Experience—that God who has been restricted by his own worshippers to the Non-Rational side of life. The modern warfare concerning the Faith is waged on the battle front of Psychology. To this front it has been driven neither by logic nor by the facts of the case, but by the tendency in Protestant theology, which in the last end, means German theology, to validate religion by experience, and to find the true field of faith within the Value-Realm.

It is true that in recent times there have been thinkers dissatisfied with an all-too-human Deity, who have seen God in the splendor of an infinite distance. But here—*Laus Deo!*—we have a theologian who not only utterly refuses to be satisfied with a finite God dependent on human psychology, but who nevertheless insists that the whole existence of ourselves and of the world is grounded in the Being of the transcendent God.

To Dr. Bauhofer, an "experienced" God, like a "comprehended" God, has ceased to be God in any true sense of the

word (p. 240). He blames the current philosophy of religion in that it gives us not a true Deity but merely a sublime "Welthhaft," whether derived from metaphysics or from psychology it matters not. "*Das Goettliche ist so wenig ein welthhaft irrationales Datum als es ein welthhaft rationales Datum ist*" (p. 2). A true philosophy of religion ought to deal not with religious phenomena, which are all finite, temporal, *welthhaft*, but with *Theos*.

The universe as we know it, including all material existences, all intellectual constructs, all subjective experiences, all the hierarchy of values, even our final concept of that which is *unending*, is entirely *welthhaft* and finite. And God is that which is *not* *welthhaft* or finite. God is the Wholly Other to all that is finite. He is on the Far Side, and no finding Him on This Side will avail if this be not recognized. "*Nur wenn Gott der schlechterdings Jenseitige, Unwelthafte ist . . . nur dann kann Gott auch der Diesseitige sein*" (p. 82, cf. pp. 265-6). In fact, we cannot find Him on This Side. All we can find, by whatever human processes, are our own thoughts, dreams, feelings, aspirations. The recognition of this utter inability of the finite to grasp the infinite is as it were a wall between man and God, but it is humanly speaking our closest approach to God (p. 226). Having known this, we wait for the Divine Self-revelation.

Nevertheless Dr. Bauhofer's answer is not one of hopelessness, of infinite distance, between the Deity and ourselves. Though he regards the matter as not within his direct field, which is the philosophy of religion, he himself is certain that the Infinite God Whom the finite cannot find and grasp, always and eternally finds and grasps us in the Person of Christ, the Word (p. 266).

In Part I, the author boldly attacks the main assumptions of modern philosophical and religious thought. First, he denies that epistemology can be the foundation of philosophy, capable of answering problems of existence (pp. 32 ff.). Both the *Cogito ergo sum* and the Kantian critique necessarily fail to lead to reality. They give us the Thinking-I but not the Reality-thinking-I, for the problem of reality is not epistemological, but is

the presupposition of every significant statement of a problem, epistemological or otherwise. Second, he denies that religion is primarily a matter of the individual soul and that therefore the religious society like a club is constituted by its members (pp. 54 ff). On the contrary, the dignity of the individual belongs only to individuals who are in living relation with a Whole. Even leaving Revelation completely out of account, the Church as a historical community is necessarily prior to all mere individual existence. Third, he denies that any true answer to the eternal question can be found within the Value-Realm (pp. 73 ff). The true concept of God, the only God worth calling by that name, still implies (even as Thomas Aquinas taught) a metaphysic of *Being*, in which all Becoming, all that is *welthaft* and temporal, find its root and meaning (p. 113).

In Part II he examines the nature of "religion" and of the "religious attitude." The assumption that religion in its various manifestations all over the world is one in nature he considers false (p. 184). There are many types, each giving an independent solution of the religious problem. New forms arise not as developments from earlier stages, but in answer to new statements of the problem brought to the fore in new historical situations. He distinguishes sharply between the "religious" and what he terms the "religioid." The religious attitude is dual. It implies a Reality over against the Self. It is this which Rudolf Otto has failed to realize (p. 196). The religioid attitude differs from the religious in being object-less. It is feeling turned back and inward upon itself, an attitude just as primitive as is the religious attitude. Emphatically, it is not religion. But if the religious attitude differs from the religioid in presupposing an Object, it must be distinguished also from cognitive attitudes which also presuppose the Object. The distinction lies in the fact that the cognitive acts are "communiciatory," the object being passive, while religious acts are "responsory," anticipating at least a *possible* response.

In Part III (pp. 232 ff) Dr. Bauhofer describes and discusses

what to him are the two end-forms, the highest reaches of the human spirit as it attempts to find God. Of these the first is Mysticism, the second is "Metareligiosity." The human spirit has tried various ways of answering the eternal question, ranging through primitive fetish- and mana-forms (p. 211), symbolic objects and acts (pp. 213 ff), and the *Via Negativa* (pp. 222 ff). All these having proved inadequate, Mysticism seeks to find God in the most highly sublimated human experience (pp. 232 ff). The metareligious attitude realizes that the "Deity" so reached is still finite and human, therefore no true Deity. Both end forms fail because in them truth and reality are separated. Mysticism reaches a reality, but that reality measured against the True Idea of what a God must be, is infinitely inadequate. Metareligiosity on the other hand holds to the True Idea of God, but has no way of knowing whether this Idea is a Real. For the validity of the True Idea is not implied in that Idea. What is implied, is that the Divine is that which is capable of being manifested only by itself. That is, a God worthy of the name must reveal Himself if we are to know of His reality. At this point we have two choices: either to assume that God reveals in everything, which leaves us still in the sphere of the *Als Ob*, or to believe in some concrete revelation—if indeed we do not conclude that the true answer is agnosticism.

Here the philosophy of religion properly so called must end. What it all points to, however, is the historical Revelation as embodied in the Church (pp. 263-4). The pathway of this thought leads and must lead towards the theology of the "Old Church," to Dogma which makes Revelation a present reality, and to Sacrament which makes Grace a present reality. We know the formula of the Eternal answer to the eternal question, it is: "Thou wouldest not seek Me, if thou hadst not already found Me, or, much better, if thou hadst not always and eternally been found of Me," and this answer is given to us in Christ (p. 266).

Among the high lights of the book the reviewer would place highest the thoughtful discussion first of our relation to the com-

munity and to the historical situation, and second of the nature of History in its relation to Time (pp. 144 ff). It is along this line of thought that the author condemns the modern attempt to find in the temporal a metaphysical province, whether it seeks this in the data of life, in values, in Dionysiac dance-rhythms, in Goethe or Beethoven, in inner aspirations, tragic fates, the Divine in the Soul, or even in the inner life of Jesus. For all of these are human, and within history (p. 165). Since "history is our only home," the overcoming of the world is not ours. It is this phase of the author's thought which leads him to see his own pathway as one that turns homeward toward *Ecclesia* (p. 263). In this connection it is of interest also that his concept of *Ecclesia* seems to be almost identical with the Anglican concept (p. 62).

Another high light, whether one agrees with his interpretation or not, is the importance he ascribes to human acceptance of the reality of death (pp. 146 ff). To him, the human preparation which enabled the Sacrifice of Calvary to take place within the history of Israel, consisted in the Hebrew willingness to face death without mythologizing or creating doctrines of immortality. The Chosen People, unfaithful in all else, at least never tried to hide from the death-terror by defining death as a mere release from a prison-house.

It is easy to see that this book traces the inner record of a spiritual pilgrimage. The author warns that the biographical background is not of public interest. Yet it is clear that not without inward struggle has his thought passed from the subjectivism of modern philosophy and theology, through the teachings of Ernst Troeltsch, Karl Barth, and others, into the position whose beginning he opens up in this book.

Such thought as this is of real significance in our time. In a recent issue of this REVIEW, Dr. Th. O. Wedel made the statement: "We must travel over again, in a world outwardly how changed, the road which led the early Church to *its* dogma, to *its* Nicene Creed, and *its* formula of Chalcedon. And this is a great

venture of faith—a venture, the necessity for which the Church has as yet, I think, scarcely realized." Dr. Bauhofer would be in complete agreement with these words. He truly states that he is only clearing the ground, and making the problem visible, for a development which demands a whole race of theologians and philosophers. May God grant us this race of theologians and philosophers to carry on the work of freeing us from the subjective mire in which our thought has been wallowing! And may God grant both their work, and this book, a wide audience!

NOTES AND COMMENTS

By BURTON SCOTT EASTON, General Theological Seminary

Otto Baumgarten (March 21st) was born in 1858 and was trained for the pastorate, in which he spent the first years of his active life. His pedagogic gifts, however, led him into teaching in 1890, when he accepted an instructorship at the University of Berlin. He was promoted to an assistant professorship in the same year—something almost without precedent in German academic circles—at Jena, and four years later to a full professorship of practical theology at Kiel, where he remained until his retirement in 1926. To Dr. Baumgarten practical theology was something to be made really practical, with the result that he was prominent in most of the reforming movements during his lifetime; in particular from 1909 to 1921 he was president of the Evangelical-Social Congress. In fact his influence was so great that he was made a member of the German Peace Delegation in 1919.

His writings were voluminous, but for the most part deal with subjects of interest only within his own country. Elsewhere he is known best by the commentary on the Johannine Epistles which he contributed to Johannes Weiss' *Schriften* (1907), his editorship of Lipsius' *Dogmatik* (1893) and his direction of the department of practical theology in the first edition of *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*.

Dawson Dawson-Walker (January 28th) was born in 1868. Educated in Oxford, he went to Durham in 1893 as classical lecturer, to be made theological tutor in 1898, Professor of Biblical Exegesis in 1910 and Professor of Divinity in 1919. His writings were chiefly of a popular expository and devotional nature.

Ernst von Dobschütz (May 20th) was born in 1870 and began teaching (at Jena) in 1893, his "Habilitationsschrift" being

Das Kerygma Petri. From Jena he went to Strassburg in 1904, then to Breslau in 1910 and in 1913 to Halle. Dr. von Dob-schütz spoke English fluently and was well known as a lecturer in England, while about 1912 he was guest professor at the University of Chicago; two of his books, *The Eschatology of the Gospels* (1910) and *The Influence of the Bible on Civilization* (1914) were written in English. His most widely known work was *Das apostolische Zeitalter* (1905), which has been translated into English, French and Swedish; his most substantial New Testament production being his commentary on Thessalonians in the Meyer series (1909). According to the publishers' announcement he was to do the forthcoming revision of both Romans and Hebrews in the same series; it is to be hoped that the manuscript for at least one of these was far enough advanced to make its publication possible.

Franz Ehrle (March 31st) was born in 1845. He entered the Jesuit order at the age of sixteen, where he distinguished himself for his scholarship and was permitted to specialize in academic work. From 1873 to 1878 he was stationed in England; in 1880 he was sent to Rome, fifteen years later being made Prefect of the Vatican Library, a position he held until the war, when he returned to Germany. In 1922 he was made Cardinal. His immense erudition is displayed in the *Archiv für Literatur und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters* (1885-1900), which he edited with Denifle, and his *Biblioteca Philosophica* (1885 ff), but in his long editorship of the *Stimmen der Zeit* he showed an extraordinary ability in bringing scholarship to the general reading public.

Lewis Richard Farnell (March 28th) was born in 1856. At Oxford—from which he graduated in 1878—he developed the passion for classical archaeology that put him in the first rank of Hellenists, especially in the religious field; his *Cults of the Greek States* is an acknowledged classic (1896). In addition he published *Evolution of Greek Religion* (1905), *The Higher Aspects of Greek Religion* (1912), *Greece and Babylon* (1911), *Greek Hero-Cults* (1921), *Outline History of Greek Religion*

(1921), *The Attributes of God* (1925) and *Pindar* (1930). In 1920 he was made Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford.

Oscar Holtzmann (March 10th?), a cousin of the celebrated Heinrich Julius Holtzmann, was born in 1859. At the age of thirty he was appointed to a New Testament chair at Giessen, which he held until 1916 when poor health led him to take a leave of absence; in 1921 he was retired. His first work was a study of the Fourth Gospel (1887); his most familiar his *Leben Jesu* (1901), translated into English in 1904 as *The Life of Jesus*; it represents admirably the conclusions of the "liberal" school of the day. His later work was chiefly devoted to the critical editing of the Mishnah tractates (in conjunction with Professor Beer); an excellent series but one that through its very excellence is condemned to an exceedingly slow progress.

Robert Forman Horton (born in 1855) was one of the most noted Congregational clergymen in England. After his graduation from Oxford in 1878 he became Fellow (of New College) and lecturer in history until 1883, when he entered the pastoral field. But this academic preparation stood him in good stead and gave a solid basis for the popular appeal of his many books (close on to forty). He was frequently in this country and Canada, and in 1893 was Lyman Beecher Lecturer at Yale.

John Edgar McFadyen (December 24th) was born in 1870. Educated in Glasgow, in 1898 he was called to Canada as Professor of Old Testament in Knox College, Toronto, but in 1910 was recalled to Glasgow to the same position in the United Free Church College. Much of his literary work consisted in translating Old Testament Books into "modern speech": the Psalms (1916), the Wisdom Books (1917), Isaiah (1918) and Jeremiah (1918). Rather more serious were his revisions of Davidson's *Hebrew Grammar* (1914 and 1924), but most of his other books were popularizing, although always in the best sense of the term.

Alan Hugh McNeile (December 14th) was born in 1871. He taught in Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, from 1897 to 1917, when he was called to the University of Dublin as Regius Professor of Divinity. His earlier work was in the Old Testament

but his commentary on St. Matthew (1915) put him into a high place in the New Testament world; after twenty years it is still unequalled in English. Unfortunately it was not followed by any similar work of the same standard; very probably through the inability to find publishers who would undertake the responsibility of such expensive volumes with so small a reading public. His later books are of a less technical nature, with his *New Testament Teaching in the Light of St. Paul's* (1923) as the most important. In 1929 he saw the late Archbishop Bernard's *St. John* through the press.

George Robert Stowe Mead was born in 1863. He was an ardent theosophist whose enthusiasm led him to translate and publish some important texts, especially the Hermetic corpus (*Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, 1906) and the Mandaean fragments significant for Christian study (*The Gnostic John*, 1924). His theosophic interpretations of the works he edited are not always lucid to the non-initiate, and it is somewhat difficult to fathom the reasons that made him detect value in the *Pistis Sophia*, which he published in a lavish edition (1921), but his work was none the less of genuine worth.

Thomas Eric Peet (January 22nd) was born in 1882. Graduated from Oxford in 1906 he turned his interests to archaeology, especially Egyptian archaeology, and conducted excavations for the Egypt Exploration Fund, beginning in 1909. His more serious work commenced with his appointment to the chair of Egyptology in Liverpool University in 1920, since when there has been a steady output of noteworthy volumes.

Paul Shorey (April 24th) was born in 1857. At first educated for the law, his interests led him into classical study and he became Professor of Greek at Bryn Mawr (1885) and then (1892) at the University of Chicago. His *Assault on Humanism* (1917) is the best known of his non-technical books.

Henry Julian White (July 16th) was born in 1859. Except for the ten years 1885–1895 all his adult life was spent in Oxford; in 1920 he was made Dean of Christ Church, a position he held until his death. His name is indissolubly connected with

the "Wordsworth & White Vulgate," with which he was associated from the beginning, being selected as the joint editor by Bishop John Wordsworth before the publication of the first part in 1889, and carrying sole responsibility for the work since the Bishop's death in 1911. The exactions of this task, the literal labor of a lifetime, naturally precluded any other literary efforts; the *Grammar of the Vulgate* (1926; with W. E. Plater) being his only other book apart from some early contributions to the *Old Latin Biblical Texts*.

BOOK REVIEWS

Theonas. Conversations of a Sage. By Jacques Maritain. Sheed and Ward, 1933, pp. viii + 200. \$2.00.

The dialogue is, to some readers, the most exasperating and least interesting of all literary forms. For them, the discussion is spoiled alike by the Socratic dialogues of Plato and the "Dolly Dialogues" of the late Mr. Anthony Hope. Yet this form has entered strongly into the philosophical literary tradition, and M. Maritain has once again resorted to it. And no matter how irritating he may find a dialogue, the reader who is interested in the present philosophical situation should persevere with this book, for he will find in it much wisdom, and many explanations of the bearings of the Neo-Thomism of which Jacques Maritain is one of the greatest exponents. True, he cannot resist the temptation to indulge in a little gentle mockery at the expense of Philonous, the eternal *amateur* of the latest thing in metaphysical notions. But then M. Maritain is honestly convinced that modern philosophy has ended—in a cul-de-sac; and deserves to be laughed at.

The departure from the Christian tradition, inaugurated by Descartes, eventually led modern thought to the impossible task of reconciling naturalism and absolute idealism. Man was, apparently, both the offspring of a biological process upon a suburban planet, and capable of a biological explanation; and also identical with the ultimate spiritual principle of the universe. And with varying emphases, school after school arose to resolve this dilemma. But the only method of resolving it is to deny both alternatives, which are the results of a false epistemology and a false metaphysic.

We must return to a true understanding of the relation of the knower to the known, before we can bring philosophy to sanity again. M. Maritain holds that the nature of the human mind is "not to produce a term external to itself, but only to perfect

in *quality* the knowing mind." This implies that "our intelligence is *dependent* upon some object not itself." Its liberty consists in this act of subjection to the object. Kant, he says, had a "profound feeling for the spontaneity of the intellectual nature, but because he believed that the act of knowing consists in *creating* the other . . . he foolishly reversed the order of dependence between the object of knowledge and the human intellect and made the human intellect the measure and law of the object."

The restoration of true balance between mind and object is essential in the Neo-Thomist reconstruction. But, rejecting the mind's creatorship in the act of knowing does not involve the derivation of mind from biological sources. On the contrary, it leads on to the metaphysic in which God is God, and man is man, and green grass is green grass—though it is not quite as simple as that!

The dialogues in this book range over a wide field of interest, and there is in each of them profound insight and a good deal of caustic comment upon the confusion of the modernist, secularist mind. The book is one more piece of evidence that amidst the collapse of the modern world, there is rising the scaffolding of a new age of faith.

W. G. PECK.

Beyond Fundamentalism and Modernism: The Gospel of God. By George W. Richards. New York: Scribner, 1934, pp. xiv + 333. \$2.00.

Dr Richards is Professor of Church History in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church. His background is that of the Reformed theologian, what he calls "the fundamentalism of the irenic sort that is found in the Heidelberg Catechism." The development of his mind he tells us has been along what one might almost call the main trunk line of modern German theology: Schleiermacher, Ritschl, Troeltsch, Barth and Brunner. He is no out and out Liberal, nor is he a Fundamentalist. His indebtedness to Barth is clear on almost every page. He is very sure that the 'social gospel' is far from representing fairly the message of Christ. No amount of social improvement will bring in

the Kingdom of God. "The world may be better off but not better." At the same time there is no question that if we put first things first, seek first the Kingdom of God and listen to his Gospel, a better social order will come to pass as a result—a kind of by-product, not a primary objective.

"The primary purpose of the gospel is not to preserve or to establish an economic order according to the dreams and the ideals of men. The rule of God is within men: the *summum bonum* of the gospel is that men think, and feel, and act according to the will of God as taught by, lived by, incarnate in, Jesus Christ, even though the heavens and the earth pass away. In this present evil world there will never be an order corresponding to the eternal purpose of God; for the present order of the world will never be better than the men and women who belong to it. Changes in government will not change hearts" (p. 316).

The great defect of our time is that the world is so largely meaningless. On the other hand, "We can tolerate anything but a meaningless world;" therefore the unrest and even despair of our times, and even our lawlessness. It is into such a world as this that the Gospel of God comes as a message of illumination and redemption. It is not man's search for God the Gospel records, it is the clear expression of God's living revelation of himself to man.

The author's wide reading is evident throughout, and there are many passages which will be suggestive to the preacher. The book as a whole is a vivid exhibition of the influence of the Barthian theology in the contemporary Protestant world.

FREDERICK C. GRANT.

Der Ruf von der Erde nach Gott und der Gottesdienst der Kirche. By Franz Köhne. Munich: Ernst Reinhardt, 1934, pp. 231. Marks 4.50.

The German High Church or Evangelical-Catholic Movement continues to be fruitful in scholarly works of conspicuous merit, and the present volume is one of the most significant of its theological productions. Dr. Köhne addresses himself to the question of the meaning of the Church, its nature and *raison d'être*, and the conditions under which these are brought to realization. In the Church, and more particularly in the Sacrament which is the center of its worship and life, God truly reveals Himself,

Christ manifests His continual presence, and the soul's quest is achieved. Amid the confusion of the present day, there is but one true path: to have recourse to the Church, and to immerse oneself in the divine life which she bears. For in this "century of the Church," she is once more coming into her own, and we have to face frankly the question whether her Divine Service (*Gottesdienst*) is really a service of God (*Gottes Dienst*); a work wrought by God (*ex opere operato*, i.e. *a Deo operato*), or simply a human performance. These are not mere assertions, but are supported with profound and powerful arguments. The author is well aware of the grave defects in Church-consciousness and life of modern Protestantism, and seeks to overcome these.

In rejecting the false simplicity of Liberalism, the writer does not fall into the arms of the Barthian Dialectical Theology. He finds God revealing Himself in three Ways, in the "beginning" as Creator and Source of all, in the present, as the Center of time, upholding all, and as the End to which all things move, the Perfecter (*Vollender*). Man's consciousness is in one sense a signal preparing him for God's Revelation, in another sense it is God's Revelation. It tells us that we *can* come to know God, but the work of faith is none the less necessary if we are to find Him. And faith leads us to find God, when and where alone He can be found: whenever and wherever He reveals Himself in space and time. But the Christian Community is the true home, the native country (*Heimat*) of faith, where God reveals Himself *ex opere operato*. Only the faith which is itself wrought by God (*ex opere operato*) can recognize and find God in the Revelation which He has wrought. And the Divine Service of the Community is the region (*Ort*) of the revelation of God in faith. In this Divine Service we find in most perfect form a Community which is infinitely more than the sum of its members; we find too the furtherance of God's atoning activity. The author recognizes the difficulties involved, and deals with the question of the possibility of knowledge of God in faith, and more particularly the whole question of the Church. The historical-critical method, in its usual abstract application, cannot settle the ques-

tion of whether Jesus Christ founded the Church or instituted the Holy Supper, nor can the meaning of the latter be known by this method alone; only the living tradition of the Church can decide such questions. In her the historical Revelation lives on as an ever-present fact. The writer accepts the realistic Catholic view of the Sacrament: "in, with and under" the elements, the very Body and Blood of Christ are present and given to us. The Sacrament thus stands in an immediate relation to creation, and the elements take on cosmic significance—"with the Holy Supper eternity begins." The evangelical character of the Divine Service is emphasized—it is all the work of grace. The relation of the three Persons of the Trinity to the Eucharist is discussed, and its practical consequences set forth. The eschatological reference of the Sacrament—too often forgotten in the West since the early Christian centuries—is brought clearly to light.

Dr. Köhne proceeds to consider the formation and structure of the Church. He recognizes that "Priesthood"—not simply the general priesthood of all believers but a specific ministerial Priesthood—is the correlative of "Community," and that Priesthood and Tradition together are the basis of the Divine Service of the Church. The Church and her Sacraments depend on the institution and the will of God, not on that of men; ordination signifies God's triumph over men, and all individualism and anti-traditionalism are foreign to the Christian spirit. The author rejects the false antithesis made between Scripture and Tradition, and other favorite catchwords of the last four centuries. The importance of Apostolic Succession is insisted on and brought into close relation to Apostolic tradition, but the writer considers that extreme need can dispense from the rigid necessities of the Succession, though once lost, no pains should be neglected to restore it. His argument at times reminds one of some of the seventeenth century English High Churchmen. He unfortunately does not face the question of whether any such need or emergency existed as a historical fact: Bishops of the old succession accepted the Reformation, both in its Calvinistic and in its Lutheran branches; and in any case, four centuries is certainly

rather a long time to go without something which is considered precious, not to say essential.

There follows an excellent elucidation of the dogma (not dogmas) of the Church, as something inseparably conjoined with her life in God, the Holy Trinity. The office of Bishop, and its organic relation to the Church as a whole, is magnified in glowing terms. Nevertheless, it is essential that the Bishop remember the rule—which we so easily forget,—of thinking with the Church (*sentire cum ecclesia*). The living, organic character of the Church is continually stressed.

The last part of the work deals with the Church and the Blessed Virgin Mary, as being in different ways, bearers of the divine life—the creaturely “nothing” exalted and transfigured by God. In his discussion of *Sancta Sophia*, in relation to the Church and the Holy Virgin, the author shows unmistakably the influence of modern Russian Orthodox thinkers, especially Soloviev, Florensky, and Karsavin. The result is something which differs as much from the cramped, legalistic scholasticism of Rome, as from the barren negations of modern Protestantism. The author rejects alike the Churchless Christianity and the motherless Christ so popular—and so impotent—at the present day. He has given us a work which summons us imperatively back to a living God, revealing Himself in Christ, making Himself known where He bestows His life, in the central Sacrament of Christ’s Church. This bald and dry summary of a most exceptional work does it much less than justice—only if it sends some to the book itself will this review be of any value.

WILLIAM H. DUNPHY.

Reflections on the End of an Era. By Reinhold Niebuhr. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934, pp. ix + 302. \$2.00.

This book is a critique of “Liberal Christianity” as a social force and suggests the part which the author thinks Christians and the Christian Church should play in social change.

The forces in human nature and in society making for discord and for social maladjustment are deeper and more powerful than

the liberal with his optimistic philosophy of melioration realizes. The privileged classes holding political and economic power need reform but do not have within them the power to reform themselves. "The judges of history are always barbarians," and the leveling of social and political and economic inequalities will come from below. This means revolution—how soon and how violent depends on a number of factors which Mr. Niebuhr discusses with characteristic lucidity. No program completely satisfying man's moral nature, can be worked out in the strife of human relations. If the Christian is to have a hand in the actual processes of social reform, he will have to choose between two unsatisfactory courses, liberalism which is hypocrisy and radicalism which is motivated not simply by the desire for justice but also by the desire for vengeance against those now in power. Of these two "semi-moral alternatives" the Christian will have to pick the second. If enough Christians had the courage to take this course it would mitigate the violence of the revolution. The radical cause needs what the Christian, and the liberal, have to give.

Liberal Christianity suffers from the same disease as liberalism in general—that of a too easy optimism. Classical Christianity is more realistic with its conviction of the sinfulness of man and its recognition of forces of evil in the world which man unaided can not overcome. But this pessimism and supernaturalism generally operate to make classical Christianity quite willing to accept the authority of existing political authority whatever it may be. There is needed a type of Christianity which has the realism of classical Christianity, but which is at the same time revolutionary. But the Christian revolutionary will have to remember that "there is no conceivable society which will ever completely incarnate the highest moral ideal of a sensitive individual or which will fully grant that individual all that his moral nature demands." When the dispossessed gain the upper hand they will discover this fact for themselves. Then they will be ready to turn to the doctrine that the only real fulfillment is to be found in religious experience, which alone makes it possible for man, with ideals

which demand perfection, to live in an imperfectible world and not despair. This assurance classical Christianity provides in its doctrine of grace.

This is a very inadequate summary of an intensely honest and stimulating book. Mr. Niebuhr knows whereof he speaks. His realism and pessimism, much like that of Spengler up to a certain point, sound a healthy warning. One feels, however, that the line between liberalism and radicalism is drawn too sharply, and at the expense of the liberal. If, as Mr. Niebuhr says, enough people "affirm the logic of history" and aid in the revolution, will not revolution fade into evolution and the distinction between the radical and the liberal cease to be a qualitative one? I, for one, would not subscribe to the belief that, at the present stage of the game, a Christian must be a political radical in order to maintain his integrity. And granted that the world of history is, humanly speaking, imperfectible, is not the Christian ideal of the Kingdom of God as both a goal to be worked for and in some sense a present reality bringing God's grace to its members needed to complete the picture of the part Christianity should play in social change?

CHARLES L. STREET.

A History of the Church: an introductory study. By Philip Hughes. Vol. I, *The World in which the Church was Founded.* New York: Sheed and Ward, 1934, pp. x + 395. \$3.50.

Philip Hughes has planned a three-volume history of the Church down to our own time to be an "introduction for English readers to the work of the best Catholic historical scholarship during the last thirty years." In the volume before us this is mainly represented by the great (but not always orthodox!) Duchesne, supplemented by Batiffol and Tixeront. Of acquaintance with the equally solid but more formidable scholarship of German Catholic historians there is no evidence. Hughes makes no claim to originality, but has an obvious gift for clear and graphic popular exposition. His description of the world into which Christianity came is excellent save for a reluctance to give the brighter aspects of paganism the credit that is their due.

Not until he loses himself in the tergiversations of Eastern policy after Chalcedon does he become tedious—and this is rather the fault of the subject-matter itself. The Byzantine controversies and Rome's part in them are carried down to the eighth century; but that new world of Western Christendom which began with the Teutonic invasions, with St. Augustine and Leo the Great, is left for the second volume. Writing under an *imprimatur*, Hughes is scrupulously 'correct' on such delicate points as the collision between St. Cyprian and Pope Stephen or the lapses of Vigilius and Honorius, while at the same time acknowledging the embarrassing facts. Cyprian raised an issue not to be settled before the Vatican Council. Vigilius and Honorius were guilty of lamentable indiscretions, but of course only under pressure. All told, there are perhaps not more than a half-dozen pages with which an Anglican would find himself in deep disagreement. By and large, the book can be read with real profit and enjoyment.

There is a decided animus against the East. The Christian Emperor at Constantinople was an "old man of the sea" clinging to the back of the Eastern Church until he had strangled it. The Bishops of Constantinople after 381 are characterized as "spiritual pirates." Eusebius of Caesarea is wrongly described as having a "Lucianist education." And in one place our author so far forgets his rôle of historian as to call the ex-monk Jovinian a "practiced debauchee." The irate St. Jerome may have said as much, but the charge is hardly fair. Cerdon the Gnostic was a Syrian, not (as on page 148) an Alexandrian. On page 252 the purport of the third canon of Sardica is mis-stated as according to Rome a general appellate jurisdiction.

P. V. NORWOOD.

Schleiermacher and Religious Education. By Andrew R. Osborn. Oxford University Press, 1934, pp. 226. \$2.50.

Rudolf Otto describes Schleiermacher as "the Church Father of modern Protestantism." Justification for such judgment is nowhere more apparent than in Schleiermacher's views on religious education. It is curious that modern Protestantism which

has so faithfully followed many of Schleiermacher's ideas in its "modern" systems of religious education, should have almost unanimously avoided all reference to his outstanding contributions in this field. Religious educators are placed in debt to Dr. Osborn for the appearance of his timely volume, a worthy commemoration of the centenary of the great theologian's death. Well written, scholarly, concise, Dr. Osborn's book should not be passed over by any who aspire to leadership in religious education. If the book has a fault it lies perhaps in its rather optimistic attempt to resolve some of the fundamental inconsistencies inherent in Schleiermacher's philosophical eclecticism.

No finer testimony to the genius of Schleiermacher could be given than that unconsciously portrayed in page after page of this book's exposition of his views on religious nurture, views which for their modernity, breadth of sympathy, historical perspective and psychologic insight claim easy precedence over many up-to-the-minute discourses. Schleiermacher's recognition that religion is caught, not taught; his appreciation of the need for a genetic approach to childhood; his disapproval of punishment and emphasis upon directed activity as a solution to disciplinary problems; his endorsement of visual education; his insistence upon the necessity of the historical and biographical approaches to religion; his advocacy of the importance of *story-telling* for infant development—in these and a hundred other practical ways are demonstrated the paternity of many of our modern Protestant curricula and techniques.

In the light of the common concern expressed by religious educators over the separation of the church in modern society from the home and school, Schleiermacher's comments on the problem will prove of no little help, although Schleiermacher's general conclusion that religious education is primarily the function of the home, with the school and the church as cooperating agencies, will scarcely find approval at a time when the American home, at least, has all but surrendered its prerogatives in this respect. Unless the Christian churches in America can somehow more effectively influence the moral development of the masses, it is

not unlikely that America may be faced with the threat of Schleiermacher's age, namely, the subordination of moral training to the demands of the state.

To the distraught Protestant religious educator of today Schleiermacher has a message of supreme importance. Although he more or less successfully divorced religion from philosophy, he insists that education must be founded on metaphysical principles. It is precisely at this point that Schleiermacher would attack the position of his modern offspring. As Dr. Osborn remarks, "Schleiermacher would have no sympathy whatever with the creedless and uncertain teaching so common in Protestant churches today." Evangelical liberal though he was, Schleiermacher was too wise and too deep a student of history not to appreciate our debt to the past. So far from dispensing with ideas of the past, he would "develop that which exists in such a way as to preserve its full vitality." Here is one point at least on which liberal Catholics would agree with Schleiermacher!

Modern religious education is suffering from the over-enthusiastic dependence of Protestantism upon scientific theory and psychological analysis. As a much needed corrective nothing could be more salutary or appropriate than that Protestantism re-discover its theological protagonist. In Schleiermacher will be found a balanced view of the relative demands of past and present, and a happy regard for the requirements of dogmatic teaching in relation to individualistic expression. Those who are fond of the social implications of religious education will likewise be rewarded by some illuminating passages upon the place of the individual Christian mind in a social world. Schleiermacher's insistence that none but sincere Christians be entrusted with religious education strikes a warning note to an over-tolerant Christianity.

Not the least attractive feature of Dr. Osborn's book is the nice discrimination used by the author. It is refreshing in a work of this sort to find an expositor who fulfils his task while avoiding on the one hand the tedious presentation of excerpts

and on the other the propagation of personal views. The material is offered in a way calculated to appeal to the modern mind, and its thoroughly practical implications will make the book of great value to the thoughtful church school teacher and administrator.

H. RALPH HIGGINS.

Oxford Apostles: a Character Study of the Oxford Movement. By Geoffrey Faber. New York: Scribners, 1934, pp. xxiii + 467. Illus. \$5.00.

When an amateur psychoanalyst turns biographer his readers may confidently look for trouble ahead; and his subject, even though he be a saint—perhaps all the more if he is a saint—is pretty certain to emerge from the psychosektion with damaged reputation. Mr. Geoffrey Faber is such a biographer, and in John Henry Newman he has as choice a victim as the Freudian technique could wish. Mr. Faber admits, indeed, that one of Newman's stature is not to be measured as easily as men of ordinary calibre. But straightway ignoring this qualification, he proceeds to subject Newman to a trying ordeal. His every instance of emotional conflict, his breakdowns, his intimate self-revelations, his casual expressions are weighed, his sense of sin and his preference for celibacy explored, his dreams interpreted, and all made the basis of arbitrary and often perverse conjecture. Now Mr. Faber would doubtless plead that in order to get at the heart of his subject he is justified in using the newest 'scientific' method. But his delight in doing so is all too evident. Before we have gone a dozen pages we find that "Newman's fundamental masculine instincts were cauterized . . . he was never to be a whole man, and as a leader he was to prove a broken reed." Much more to the same effect, until on page 346 we come to an utterly unpardonable reference to the "escort of hermaphrodites."

The discriminating reader who is prepared to make allowances will find, however, a wealth of acute and illuminating observations on Newman's enigmatic character, and much else besides.

Mr. Faber has other qualifications. Himself a Fellow of All Souls, grandson of Francis Atkinson and grandnephew of Frederick Faber, contemporaries of Newman at Oxford, he knows

and loves the colorful University of a century ago and draws with easy grace living portraits of the great personalities who strode along the High in those stirring days. He makes no claim at being a theologian, and his defective acquaintance with ecclesiastical history is painfully obvious in spots. A liberal in religion, he warms to the task of rescuing R. D. Hampden from the ill repute into which Tractarian pens have plunged him. But Mr. Faber's main interest is literary: stylistically the book is superb. When he ventures into the field of criticism he runs the risk of arousing the ire of some—as when he calls Keble (as poet) the “Ella Wheeler Wilcox of his time.” And although he admits that Newman wrote an occasional good line he rates his verse as generally little better than Keble's.

If one can overlook the extravagancies of the author's psychoanalytical method and his infrequent errors of fact, one will find in this volume a stimulating account of the academic environment amid which the Anglican revival came to birth.

P. V. NORWOOD.

NOTES ON NEW BOOKS

The Fading Margin: A Study in Evolutionary and Christian Ethics. By E. C. Owen. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1934, pp. vii + 174. 5 s.

This book, by the Head Master of an English Boarding School, is as much a book of apologetics as a book of ethics. He sketches the confusion of thought in which people, especially young people, find themselves today, and finds a solution for it in an exposition of the Christian way of life in terms of General Smuts' "Holism." One has the feeling that Holism is neither very good science nor very good mythology and that the philosophical background of the book is unsatisfactory. But the book is full of happy illustrations and passages that show real knowledge of religion and real knowledge of human nature and both the preacher and the general reader will find in it a great deal of valuable and suggestive material.

C. L. S.

Christian Life in the Modern World. By Francis Underhill. Milwaukee: Morehouse, 1934, pp. iii + 258. \$2.40.

This book is a popular discussion of some important aspects of the Christian life, from the point of view of an Anglo-Catholic of wide experience and broad sympathies. Among others are chapters on belief in God, prayer, meditation, confession and absolution, the authority of the church and the place of mind in the Christian life.

An interesting example of the author's point of view is his sympathetic treatment of the Oxford Group Movement in the chapter on confession. This is a good book for clergy or lay people who want to do some fresh thinking about their religion.

C. L. S.

The Concordat of 1801: a Study of the Problem of Nationalism in the Relations of Church and State. By Henry H. Walsh. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1933, pp. 239. \$3.50.

This volume deals not so much with the arrangement by which Napoleon sought to bind the fortunes of Catholicism and the Papacy to the wheels of French nationalism and his own destiny, as with the reactions to that attempt from political and ecclesiastical opinion in France. Particularly significant is the retreat of Gallicanism, as formulated in the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges and the *propositiones cleri Gallicani* of 1682, before the Ultramontanism of de Maistre and Veuillot. The abiding strain between modern integral nationalism and papal Catholicism is clearly brought out. Dr. Walsh is now a priest of the Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Rhode Island.

N.

Civitas Dei. By Lionel Curtis. London: Macmillan, 1934. pp. xxiii + 297. \$4.25.

The author describes this book as "an attempt to discover a guiding principle in politics." Cast in the form of a running survey of history from the dawn of man's social activity to the evolution of the British Parliamentary system, it finds in the latter the most perfect realization in politics of the mind of Jesus, the universal altruist. As the British Commonwealth is a great advance upon Greek urban democracy, so an extension of the British constitution to a world-commonwealth is held to offer the best promise for human security and social well-being in ages to come. While it contains little that is new or particularly significant, the book is interesting as a review of the long struggle between autocracy and the ideal of public responsibility in government. N.

A Small Part. By John Newton McCormick. Milwaukee: Morehouse, 1934. pp. 165. \$1.75.

Recollections of the Diocese of Southern Ohio. By Boyd Vincent, Milwaukee: Morehouse, 1934. pp. 189. \$2.00.

Not often do two bishops give the world their reminiscences on the same publication date! The Bishop of Western Michigan writes in delightful vein and with a host of literary allusions the narrative of his ministry. His book will prove a valuable source for the history of the Church's activity during the great war. Its final chapter is a bracing and courageous analysis of the situation which confronts us today as Churchmen.

Bishop Vincent tells with characteristic modesty, if with less literary charm, the story of the progress of the Church in Southern Ohio during two generations. There are chapters on diocesan institutions, parishes, and missions. In a sense the book supplements—at least for the present—the late Dr. Smythe's splendid history of the Diocese of Ohio. N.

Archbishop Peckham as a Religious Educator. By John Laimbeer Peckham. (*Yale Studies in Religion*, no. 7.) Scottdale, Penn.: Mennonite Publishing House, 1934. pp. 144. \$1.50.

It is becoming increasingly recognized that the Franciscan prelate who occupied the see of Canterbury, 1279-92, was one of the greatest among the successors of Augustine and Anselm. Not only was he an able administrator; recent research is reclaiming to his credit theological and philosophical works generally attributed to St. Bonaventura. This monograph deals with Peckham as spiritual leader and reformer of clerical life and education, whose influence can be traced down to the eve of the Reformation. Withal, it is a worthy contribution to the understanding of a mediaeval figure of real importance, although perhaps of restricted interest. N.

The Life of Cardinal Mercier. By John A. Gade. Scribner, 1934, pp. ix + 312.
\$2.75.

A biography of the great Belgian cardinal by a Protestant who seeks to build up "an impartial but sympathetic picture of the man, Désiré Joseph Mercier." The part played by Mercier in the Kantian reaction and the resurgence of Thomism is depicted with accuracy and imagination. The better known war years when the Cardinal appears as a hero likewise receive their due share of attention. The one disappointing feature of the book is the author's inadequate idea of the Anglican Communion, which group he equates with the Protestant sects. "He (i.e. l'Abbé Portal) understood clearly that although the Anglican Church was in principle Protestant, it had still to a large extent retained Roman Catholic forms and ritual" (p. 241). Such a statement reveals a lack of that sound scholarship necessary to a writer dealing with the question of Christian reunion.

J. S. H.

Teaching Religion Today. By George Herbert Betts. Abingdon Press, 1934,
pp. 268. \$1.25.

This is not a new edition of Dr. Betts' *How To Teach Religion*, but is an entirely new work designed to take its place. To hazard a general estimate, the present book seems to allow more importance to the subject matter of religious education. There is much illustrative material taken from the actual responses of children receiving religious instruction—which helps to keep the teaching method more closely geared to actual problems.

The book marks no departure from Dr. Betts' earlier position, but is an even more valuable book than its predecessor.

The Modern Reader's Bible for Schools: New Testament. By Richard G. Moulton. Macmillan, 1931, pp. 437. \$1.50.

This is a new issue of the companion volume to the Old Testament similarly treated by Dr. Moulton. His *Modern Reader's Bible* has been for a generation now one of the most valuable popularizations of our sacred literature—not by way of a new translation but simply through the skilful use of modern typography. The two volumes in which the work is abridged for the use of schools form together one of the finest presentations the Old and New Testaments have ever received. There are excellent notes in the back of each volume, but the most valuable thing about the two is the readable modern setting the biblical books have been given.

Creative Teaching. By John Wallace Suter, Jr. New York: Macmillan, 1934,
pp. 155. \$1.25.

This is a new and revised edition of Mr Suter's 'Letters to a Church School Teacher,' originally issued in 1924. The book has been improved during the decade and is an excellent one to place in the hands of Church School teachers.

The Church Anthem Book. Ed. by H. Walford Davies and Henry G. Ley. Oxford University Press, 1933, pp. xvi + 562. \$2.50.

For those seeking what is best in devotional music, this book of one hundred anthems should prove an interesting and valuable anthology. When the cost of sheet music is considered, it is to be wondered that choirmasters do not more often use a standard collection such as the one under consideration. The aim of the book is to provide choirs with a basic collection of anthems, chosen from the best examples of all schools, old and new, and of varying degrees of difficulty. Among the composers represented are French, Russian, English, German, Italian, and American. The selections were made by the editors from anthems which had, through many years of testing, stamped themselves upon their minds as beautiful and fitting. Their training in choice and usage was under the direction of Sir Walter Parratt of St. George's Chapel, Windsor, whose tenet it was to draw upon the finest examples of the sacred choral music of every nation and type.

One of the most valuable sections of the book contains suggestions for choirs, e.g. on the purpose of anthem singing, the importance of discipline in practice, and the best way of commencing the study of new anthems. Each part in every number is provided with solfa notation, a welcome addition for those who have learned this method in the public schools. In the index are indicated those anthems which have been published on phonograph records; there is also an arrangement of anthems by seasons of the Church Year and occasions when they would be especially suitable.

While it is perhaps not possible to be wholly satisfying in the choice of numbers, the editors, by long experience and much consultation, have gathered together an admirable collection. Such a compact volume of one hundred anthems by representative composers enables choirs to extend their repertoire at comparatively small cost, and at the same time assures them that they are using the best in sacred choral music.

C. B. R.

Official Yearbook of the National Assembly of the Church of England, 1934.
New York: Macmillan, 1934, pp. xii + 802. \$2.00.

Though more official than our *Living Church Annual* the present volume contains similar material and is like it an indispensable reference volume. It is issued by the Press and Publications Board of the Church Assembly and is published by S. P. C. K. It is now in its fifty-second year of issue.

Since it is sold in this country by Messrs Macmillan of New York, it is to be hoped that it will become more widely available for reference in the American Episcopal Church. Considering its size and voluminous content the price is merely nominal.

Miscellaneous

The Unforgotten Prisoner. By R. C. Hutchinson. Farrar and Rinehart, 1934, pp. 564. \$2.75.

This long and very well written novel is the sombre talk of a lad, born of a German mother and an English father, who goes mad as the result of the

ghastly conditions in Germany following the war. In England they are still playing cricket, with great emphasis upon the proper flannels and all that—the game as elaborately described is to an American one of the really boresome passages of the book—while in Germany scene after scene is portrayed in macabre fashion, of starvation, burning, pillaging, rape, battle, murder and sudden death. The contrast of the English and German scenes is dramatic and well done, though over-done.

The book abounds in thrilling episodes and some excellent psychological analysis. There are too many episodes, however, to keep the unity of the story and the tense interest of the reader. The description of life in a Roman Catholic Abbey School for boys is the best part of the book. Casanova himself scrambling over the tiles does not surpass the exciting experience of the lad Klaus escaping from the Penitential Chamber. The thieves' kitchen in the old factory in Birnewald is a masterpiece of description; the siege of it by the soldiery and its defense by the riff-raff within its burning walls is a thrilling piece of good old-fashioned melodrama.

Americans appear but once, being represented by a young man in a deserted German village who is maintaining a branch of the Chicago United Trust Bank in this dismal and forsaken spot! Just why he is introduced it is difficult to say unless it be to provide an opportunity for the author, as indeed he acknowledges, "to allow himself a little burst of untempered enthusiasm for a group of friends that this American represents." And here is the little burst of enthusiasm: "Mentally I have always made an arbitrary division of Americans into three kinds:—those I meet anywhere between Boston and Los Angeles who with all their diversity seem to have the common characteristics of sturdiness, friendliness and strong national feeling (by which I do not mean patriotism); those I meet travelling in Europe who with their opulence and philistinism are even more provoking than the fellow-countrymen whom one seems always to find abroad, the type that is too national to suffer transportation and that blossoms on a strange soil into extravagant vulgarity; and last the American living in Europe—not in England—who is the home-found product quickened, magnified into a character which I describe for want of a better epithet, as Grecian; Grecian is not a good adjective, for its connotation is too particular: but I am still seeking for a phrase that will describe the cool sophistication, the intensified friendliness, the magnetic temperament of the native of Chicago or Philadelphia that I find in a little flat, American furnished, in Brussels and Rome and Vienna, even in Saratov."

Such high praise tempts us; and yet we are bound to repeat that this tale is much too long, much too dismal, and much too detailed in its tiresome conversations between the English characters who have their customary way of talking in what must seem to them enormously clever jargon, but to readers in general is for the most part dull nonsense.

It is really a pity that so able a writer as Mr. Hutchinson should not practice that economy—that fine ability to *omit*—which is the sure sign of superior artistry.

G. C. S.

Men Wanted. By Bernard Iddings Bell. Harpers, 1933, pp. xiii + 85. \$1.00.

Ten bellicose explosions that rock the complacency of the machine-made modern with a complimentary preface by Shailer Mathews and an appendix on Morals, Undergraduates and the Church throw in for good measure. J. H.

God and Lady Margaret. By John Oxenham. New York: Longmans, Green, 1933, pp. 150. \$1.50.

This prolific English writer has written a charming story of a friendship begun in the Haute Savoie. "J. O." and Lady Margaret share together the beauties of the surrounding country, and in the big, wide drawing room of Lady Margaret's cottage discuss the deepest things of their common faith. "What do you make it all?"—to John Oxenham. Answers he, "I don't think I have got any farther than you have, perhaps not so far. But it's good to remember at times that we are like the weavers under the carpet. We see only the seamy side—the whole of the pattern is hid from us—as yet. Perhaps it is too big for us."

The almost too perfect character of Lady Margaret is made distinctly more human by the great well of despair into which she is plunged just at the time when her brother crashes in Iraq.

J. S. H.

Russia Challenges Religion. By George Mecklenburg. New York: Abingdon Press, 1934, pp. 128. \$1.00.

The Pastor of the Wesley Church in Minneapolis, in a twenty-page introduction, describes the working of "The Organized Unemployed, Incorporated" in Minneapolis. The remainder of the book is given over to a discussion of modern Russia, a country with which the author is quite familiar. Outside of Democracy, Dr. Mecklenburg finds Communism deadest and Fascism the liveliest political philosophy of today. Russia, not yet able to practice Communism, contents herself at present with State Capitalism.

The author finds religious persecutions at a minimum under Stalin's régime; churches are crowded with worshippers, although apparently the Church has done little to meet the new challenge.

Surrounded by fourteen other nations, each nation a problem, Russia's foreign policy for the last fourteen years has been to keep out of entangling alliances, out of isolation, and out of war, this while Russia is educating its 160,000,000 population towards Communism. The author admits that the Russian people are kept contented by means of libelous and incorrect news items concerning capitalistic countries, but he points out that the same thing occurs in the Press of our own and other western countries.

The science of Penology is evidently much farther advanced than it is in our country, Geranski Prison colony being a sufficient warranty for this statement. Racial difficulties are at a minimum, since all work towards the definite goal of material self-sufficiency. There is little difference between present-day Russia

and present-day America—both are striving to produce a controlled economic order. But Russia presents us with a challenge: whether or not religion can produce the vital force necessary to inspire and control the construction of a new society.

The book is sketchy, but full of interesting statements. The sacramental side of Christianity is totally ignored, giving a very one-sided picture of the Faith. One possible misstatement occurs on page 58: "It seems likely that the Czar, Nicholas II, knew nothing of the 'Coronation tragedy' until the day following."

J. S. H.

SUSTAINING MEMBERS

VOLUME XVI

The following subscribers have assisted, by the purchase of additional subscriptions, in publishing the present Volume of this REVIEW. To them the Editors wish to express publicly their cordial thanks.

THE REV. FREDERIC M. ADAMS	THE REV. JULIAN D. HAMLIN
THE REV. C. RANKIN BARNES	THE REV. FRANK T. HALLETT
THE REV. W. S. BISHOP, D.D.	THE REV. T. L. HARRIS
THE REV. H. L. BOWEN, D.D.	THE REV. HENRY A. S. HARTLEY, M.D., D.D.
THE RT. REV. THOS. DUBOSE BRATTON, D.D., LL.D.	THE REV. FLEMING JAMES, D.D.
THE RT. REV. BENJAMIN BREWSTER, D.D.	THE REV. FRANKLIN JOINER, D.D.
THE REV. FREDERICK D. BUTLER, D.D.	THE REV. A. D. KELLEY
THE RT. REV. THOMAS CASTADY, D.D., S.T.D.	THE REV. W. O. KINSOLVING
THE REV. ROBERT S. CHALMERS, D.D.	THE REV. A. E. KNICKERBOCKER, D.D.
THE RT. REV. EDWARD THOS. DEMBY, D.D., LL.D.	THE REV. PAUL S. KRAMER, Ph.D.
THE REV. EDWARD HENRY ECKEL, D.D.	THE RT. REV. JAMES M. MAXON, D.D.
THE RT. REV. WM. F. FABER, D.D.	THE VERY REV. GERALD G. MOORE, D.D.
THE REV. FREDERIC S. FLEMING, D.D.	THE REV. FRANK H. NELSON, D.D.
THE REV. WALLACE J. GARDNER, D.D.	THE REV. ALFRED S. NEWBERY
	THE RT. REV. ROBERT L. PADDOCK, D.D.

THE RT. REV. HERMAN PAGE,
D.D.

THE REV. FRANCIS L. PAL-
MER, D.D.

THE REV. Z. B. PHILLIPS,
D.D.

THE REV. HOWARD C. ROB-
BINS, D.D.

THE REV. WM. PORKESS, D.D.

THE RT. REV. CHARLES S.
REIFSNIDER, D.D.

THE RT. REV. E. CECIL SEA-
MAN, D.D.

THE REV. CHARLES N. SHEP-
HERD, D.D.

THE REV. GEORGE F. SMYTHE,
D.D.

THE REV. SAMUEL SUTCLIFFE

THE REV. B. Z. STAMBAUGH

THE REV. GEORGE H. THOMAS,
D.D.

THE REV. J. MCNEAL WHEAT-
LEY

THE REV. E. C. YOUNG, Th.D.

THE REV. W. H. ZEIGLER